*The* QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLIII FEBRUARY 1957 NUMBER 1

# ELOCUTION—A DEFINITION AND A CHALLENGE

W. M. Parrish

A CURRENT fashion among teachers of speech is to greet any mention of "elocution" or "elocutionists" with a knowing smile of amused superiority. Yes, yes, we say tolerantly, but with repressed annoyance, that sort of thing flourished in a former era, but it is no longer with us. What one teacher calls the age of "hollow bombast and grandiloquence," of "simpering adolescents" and "affected females"[1] in public recitation is, we pretend, happily past. We are not elocutionists, we are artist-interpreters; and what we teach is the oral interpretation of literature.

The durability and extent of this opprobrium in the word "elocution" is not easily accounted for. Apparently it is not so pervasive in England where books containing the word in their titles are still published.[2] But in America the word is anathema. Perhaps the last stand in its defense was made by Robert Irving Fulton in a paper read before the public speaking section of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1913. "I can find no cause for the criticism of the term 'elocution,'" he said, "save that which grows out of ignorance or pedagogic cowardice. I pity the man who is afraid to say the word 'elocution.' Elocution is as essential to the whole course of public speaking as grammar or rhetoric is to the whole course in English. I doubt seriously if some of the teachers present could stand a passing examination upon that subject."[3]

But he was fighting in a lost cause. The National Association of Elocutionists gave way to the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking. Training in oratory was abandoned for the study of public speaking. And while teachers of oral reading continued to be concerned with the preparation of lecture-recitals and with training students to speak pieces in public, they began to call their discipline "expression," then changed that to "interpretation," and in the process shifted their interest

*Wayland Maxfield Parrish, Professor Emeritus of Speech at the University of Illinois, is now living in Florida and is giving courses at the University of Florida. In the pages of* QJS *and the councils of the SAA, and through his textbooks and his scholarly work, especially in Whately, he has contributed for many years to the development of the best in our profession. He says that the present article is his "last word" on elocution.*

[1] Barnet Baskerville, "I Teach Speech," *AAUP Bulletin*, XXXIX (1953), 59.

[2] John Millard's *Grammar of Elocution* was republished as late as 1935, and Gloria Brent's *First Lessons in Elocution* appeared in 1945.

[3] Robert Irving Fulton, "College Courses in Public Speaking," *English Journal*, III (1914), 160.

and their emphasis from the study of vocal expression to the study of literature.

The artificiality and affectation of the late nineteenth-century elocutionists are not defensible on any grounds, but the attendant concern for the pattern of expression was highly commendable, and it is something we have lost. In our revulsion against the bad taste of the elocutionists we have assumed that it was due to the mechanical method of analysis and preparation they employed. We have therefore abandoned such methods, but since we have nothing comparable to substitute for them, except the loose practices we call "the natural method," we are left in the absurd position of trying to teach without systematic procedure. The result is that we have ceased to give proper attention to that vital aspect of spoken language which those who shun the word "elocution" sometimes call "vocal expression."

For this aspect of linguistic study "elocution" is a useful and needed word. Better than any other it denotes that constant and inescapable element of all live speech—the movement of the voice with relation to meaning and feeling, the proper management of emphasis and subordination, pause and tempo, word-grouping, intonation and inflection. John Mason, who might be regarded as the originator of the elocution movement in England, called it "the right management of the voice in reading and speaking."[4]

It is highly important that this elocutionary aspect of speech—the expressive action of the voice in conveying meaning—be isolated and considered by itself. By both lay and professional critics of speech it is nearly always confused with such other elements as voice quality, pronunciation, and gesture. It is not necessarily affected by these and can best be examined and taught as a thing apart from them, just as we can consider the expression of a violin player quite apart from the tone of his instrument (voice), his accuracy of note (pronunciation), and his physical behavior (gesture).

Elocution is an aspect of all utterance, whether the speaker is delivering a public address, reading a poem to others, acting in a play, or conversing across the dinner table, for in all forms of speech a large part of meaning is conveyed by the pattern of expression. It is thus a more fundamental thing than the oral interpretation of literature, with which it is often equated. Literature may be, and generally is, interpreted by means of critical essays, and for this discipline teachers of speech are far less competent and less adequately trained than professors of literature. The distinctive function of elocution is to give voice to what a competent interpreter, who may or may not be the elocutionist, has discovered about the meaning of a literary work, and the test of expertness in elocution would come in instructing an interpreter, say a professor of literature, in how to communicate vocally to others his conception of a literary work. For such a task what is needed is not so much a knowledge of literature as a knowledge of spoken language and its conventional use in communication.

How is this conventional pattern of spoken language to be discovered; and how taught? In the discussion and criticism of elocution a bewildering confusion has arisen from the loose and uncritical employment of the words "natural," "mechanical," and "artificial." An arbitrary distinction has been set up between the "natural method" and

[4] John Mason, *An Essay on Elocution, or Pronunciation* (London, 1748).

the "mechanical method," and Thomas Sheridan is called the leader of one "school" and John Walker of the other (though their methods and conceptions are essentially the same), and all later teachers of elocution are assigned to one school or the other. The fact is that all the early elocutionists took nature as their guide, all but Cockin insisted that one would read well if he would only speak as in earnest conversation. Even James Rush, whose mechanical system dominated most of the nineteenth century, was as vocal as any other in his devotion to Nature.[5]

"Natural" is a highly ambiguous word and needs careful definition. It has been used loosely in discussing elocution, and always as a term of unqualified praise, though man's best efforts in science and art for 2000 years have been directed toward perfecting or improving upon nature. Teachers who would not think of condoning natural bursts of temper, natural spellings, or natural perversions of grammar, will yet insist that vocal utterance must be natural. And though they may admire the mechanical perfection of a pianist, a ballet dancer, or a football team, they are strongly opposed to any savor of the mechanical in speech. It is odd too that while insisting that speech must be natural, they often prefer to read, and have their students read, materials that require them to be *un*natural. Not concerned with effective expression of normal thought in normal situations, they seek out odd and eccentric characters to be impersonated and often prefer to catch them in the throes of some violent and perverted passion.

But in discussions of vocal expression, the term "mechanical" is generally applied to an elocution that is *deliberately designed* instead of being left to the speaker's thinking and feeling at the moment of utterance. But if the design is worked out by the speaker himself instead of copied from another, if it is intended to improve communicative efficacy, to achieve a norm of naturalness, or, in impersonation, to represent the speech of a character unlike himself, there would seem to be no valid ground for objecting to the use of such a method. By it, as by speaking spontaneously, a speaker may or may not achieve a result that will *seem* natural and spontaneous.

The important thing about a speaker's elocution is not whether it is spontaneous rather than pre-designed but whether it is normal—whether it conforms to the pattern that a cultivated audience is accustomed to hearing, whether it is effective as communication. Such an elocution is best defined as the Webster dictionaries define standard pronunciation: "the usage that now prevails among educated and cultured people to whom the language is vernacular." Our essential task is to discover for each sentence to be spoken this normal pattern of elocution. There is obviously considerable variation within this standard, but so far as the expression of simple factual meaning is concerned there is practical uniformity. The utterance of highly emotional passages, as in drama and poetry, is much more variable and may not always have a standard pattern. What our students need primarily, however, is direction in the speaking of plain prose. And if there is not always a "right" way to speak an ordinary expository sentence, there are at least many wrong ways.

We must also distinguish between naturalness in elocution and a natural method of acquiring a proper elocution,

[5] James Rush, *The Philosophy of the Human Voice* (Philadelphia, 1827). See my "The Concept of 'Naturalness'," *QJS*, XXXVII (1951), 448.

since most of the controversy over natural and mechanical methods has been concerned with methods of teaching or learning. The reasons for the current antipathy to teaching by the so-called mechanical method are seldom clearly stated or understood. We prejudge the issue by denominating anything mechanical as bad, and anything natural as good. The elocutionists who adopted the terminology of James Rush usually told their students where to pause, and how long; what to emphasize, and how much; and sometimes indicated the desired intonation by notes on a musical staff. If the student followed these prescriptions of his teacher without giving attention to the meaning of what he uttered, he was indeed being taught by a mechanical method, and one that few will defend. Some methods less specifically prescriptive have at times also been called mechanical. John Walker has been assigned to the mechanical school because he laid down certain rules for pauses and inflections, rules based upon grammatical structure. James Burgh is called mechanical because he described the expression of various passions and attitudes, though his descriptions are very general. If knowing and following rules for elocution are to be condemned, one might as well object to knowing and following the rules of grammar. Objection to a description of how the voice should behave would seem to be an objection to understanding what one is teaching.

Rush's elaborate and detailed terminology for describing the action of the voice is in itself valid and useful and unobjectionable. Whether he was accurate in applying it to the speech of his day is another matter. He was a highly original and eccentric person. But if he did fail to describe accurately the elocutionary patterns of his day, that fact does not invalidate his system of describing them. It furnished to later elocutionists a definite and accurate method of indicating vocal expression, and was useful in directing attention to more careful utterance. The violations of good sense and good taste by his disciples were not due to the symbols they used in teaching and would doubtless have been just as obnoxious if Rush had never lived. They were due to conditions of the time and to the universal passion for ostentatious display to be found in people of a certain level of culture, and still manifested in some present-day radio and television shows, in popular entertainments, and in school declamation contests.

Our censure, then, should be reserved for the quality of the elocutionists' performances, not applied to the method by which they taught, or were taught. There can be no doubt that some of them by the use of mechanical means, that is, by deliberately designed elocution, achieved an expression that seemed to competent observers normal and natural and even spontaneous, just as most of our better actors still do. Some of them were ladies and gentlemen of intelligence, culture, and good taste, and their recitations and teachings were sensible and wholesome. The method they used, a method of careful analysis and studied design, should not be condemned and rejected because some, even a majority, abused it. It is objectionable only when so used as not to involve the reader's thought and feeling, and when he does not learn to discover for himself the appropriate patterns of utterance.

Let us inquire next whether a "natural" method of teaching elocution can be found and, if so, how it operates. The fathers of the elocutionary movement believed that everyone would read well if he would only read as he customarily

spoke in earnest talk, if he kept his mind on what he was saying and "followed nature." Perhaps that was true of the relatively small group of cultivated persons for whom they wrote—preachers, lawyers, and the like, and it may be true of some of our students today who come from good speech environments. But many have not been blessed with such an environment. Their conversational speech may be as bad as their reading, and our object is not to strengthen their existing habits, but to improve them. The injunction to read naturally will not lead them to acquire a normal elocution any more than an injunction to play naturally will develop a competent violinist. Such an injunction is open also to the charge that it is not a method, and it is not teaching. A course of instruction can hardly consist merely of the simple direction, "Speak naturally."

Nearly all of those who espouse the "speak naturally" method seem to realize this difficulty, for they proceed to give some specific instructions in how to manage pause, emphasis, and modulation in the speaking of particular sentences. That is, they lapse into the method that is frequently condemned as mechanical. Is there, then, no method of teaching except by explaining what to emphasize, where to pause, etc.? It will be well to examine some of the works of those who tried to teach without resorting to mechanical prescription.

There has probably been no more thoroughgoing advocate of the natural method than Richard Whately.[6] He objected to the use of any marks to indicate expression, such as Sheridan proposed, because such a system could not be effective and would be sure to result in an artificial elocution. His prescription for good reading or speaking is, "Impress but the mind fully with the sentiments, etc. to be uttered; withdraw the attention from the sound, and fix it on the sense; and nature, or habit, will spontaneously suggest the proper delivery."[7] He does not allow that a reader may keep his mind on what he is saying and at the same time pay some attention to how he is saying it. "A reader," he says, "is sure to pay *too much* attention to his voice, not only if he pays *any at all,* but if he does not strenuously *labour to withdraw* his attention from it altogether."[8] It seems not to have occurred to him that this strenuous labor might distract attention from the sense. He does recognize that "if anyone has, in common discourse, an indistinct, hesitating, provincial, or otherwise faulty delivery, *his* natural manner certainly is not what he should adopt in public speaking; but he should endeavor by care, to remedy the defect, not in public speaking only, but in ordinary conversation also."[9] How this care is to be exercised he does not say, except that "the remarks of an intelligent friend will be beneficial."[10] Certainly such faults could not be corrected merely by keeping the mind fully occupied with the sense at the moment of utterance.

The late Professor Winans criticized Whately for neglecting the "sense of communication," the "feeling of contact with the audience."[11] But neither he nor Whately directs the speaker to give some attention to discovering and following the pattern of utterance to which the audience is accustomed, and by

[6] Richard Whately, *Elements of Rhetoric*, 7th ed. (London, 1846). The first edition was in 1828.

[7] P. 350.
[8] P. 352.
[9] P. 389.
[10] P. 359.
[11] James A. Winans, "Whately on Elocution," *QJS*, XXXI (1945), 1.

which it will most readily receive what is uttered, that is, to normal elocution. A sense of communication is indeed desirable. It tells the audience that the speaker means to be heard. But it will not help them to understand him if the vocal pattern he uses is not familiar to them.

One of the most noteworthy and influential attempts to escape the mechanics of the Rush system and define a natural method of teaching elocution was that of S. S. Curry, who used and popularized the term "expression." "The real province of expression," he said, "is the art of revealing the ideals and conceptions, the emotions, experience and character of man." Expression is "the manifestation of the soul through the body." All expression must be *"from within outward."*[12] He insisted that there can be no good expression without proper impression, that we should try to stimulate the cause of expression, and that the chief problem is to stimulate the mind to the possession and realization of ideas at the moment they are spoken. Curry's theory applies well enough to a normal speaker who is giving utterance to his own thoughts and feelings, but he has some difficulty in extending it to cover reading and acting. "Vocal expression," he says, "manifests the speaker's own thought and feeling, or his assimilation and realization of that of others."[13] But in either case expression would seem to be *self*-expression, rather than communication.

He disparaged Whately's method as merely "impulsive," but it is difficult to see why that adjective does not apply as well to his own system. His devotion to Nature was as complete as that of any eighteenth-century disciple of Rousseau. Again and again he used such phrases as "according to the intention of nature," "found in nature," "nature's intended means," "nature's intention." Like others both before and after him, he assumed a priestly familiarity with the wishes and designs of the god, Nature, and was generally content to rest upon this vague mystic standard. Never did he explain in specific terms just how the god reveals himself, or how one should approach the oracle. The student, instead of making an objective study of the inflections of competent speakers, is directed to study his own inflections "until he realizes their importance and also their right use."[14] He does indeed say in one place that there must be "not only a study of what is habitually natural but of what is ideally natural, what is nature's normal tendency rather than the human perversion,"[15] but he gives no indication of how this ideal normal standard is to be discovered. He could have found a suggestion in Aristotle's *Poetics,* but in a chapter on The Imitative School he hopelessly confuses imitation of another's method of reading with the concept of imitation of nature in Aristotle's aesthetic. Though he quotes Nathan Sheppard as saying that "delivery may be natural and yet be wrong," he does not answer him, and he fails to deal adequately with bad natural expression, saying only that man must be normalized and then his expression will be good.

When in his later works Curry tried to give his theories practical application he was able to define clearly and concretely just what pattern the voice must follow in effective communication only by using the terminology and method of the mechanical elocutionists whom he decried. He uses such Rushian

[12] S. S. Curry, *The Province of Expression* (Boston, 1891), p. 30.
[13] S. S. Curry, *Imagination and Dramatic Instinct* (Boston, 1896), p. 19.
[14] S. S. Curry, *Foundations of Expression* (Boston, 1907), p. 50.
[15] *The Province of Expression,* p. 210.

terms as "concrete interval."[16] He lays down such rules as, "A rising inflection expresses doubt or question . . . formality, triviality," etc.; "The falling inflection . . . indicates conviction, certainty. . . . It implies genuineness, directness, and earnestness."[17] Putting the weight on both feet with the feet apart "expresses familiar ease, vulgar repose, impudence, indifference, insolence. Animation, regard for others, excitement, courage, sympathy, and endeavor lift the body and bring the weight upon one foot."[18] "An extreme emotion causes gravitation, or the passing of the weight to the forward foot."[19] In his analysis of Portia's "mercy" speech he says that Portia "accentuates the word 'strain'd' with something of a circumflex inflexion indicating her surprise; . . . 'sceptre' also is given a rising inflexion as practically the same as 'crown.' The word 'temporal' has a strong falling inflexion as antithetic to 'mercy' which is spiritual,"[20] etc. And he says that in the sentence "I met your friend last night," "The words before 'friend' have rising inflexions, but there is a long fall from a higher pitch upon 'friend,' as 'friend' is the emphatic word, and all the words following it have a short fall on a lower pitch."[21]

This is certainly not evolving expression "from within outward," it is not making expression the "manifestation of the soul," and it is not teaching by the "natural" method. Apparently Curry found that his theory was not valid when put into practical use.

He did, however, exert a wholesome influence in discouraging reading that was merely mechanical and in urging that a reader should think of what he is reading and try to feel the emotions indicated. Though he could not succeed in deriving correct expression and effective communication from re-creation of thought and feeling, he went a good deal beyond Whately in showing how the mind operates in thinking of the meaning of a sentence and how this thinking affects expression. He did not go far enough, however, and it remained for later writers to demonstrate how the logic of a sentence indicates the proper utterance of it.

The analysis of meaning and its effect upon utterance was probably carried to its highest development in the works of S. H. Clark and James A. Winans published in 1915.[22] Clark owns no indebtedness to Curry or other previous writers and he escapes their mechanical practices largely because he is concerned with getting meaning from the printed page rather than with expressing it. His chief contribution is in showing how meaning inheres in word-groups and their relations to each other —an idea which Curry stated but did not adequately develop.

Winans' emphasis is on accentuating "mental processes which are the natural cause of expression."[23] He develops the importance of grouping in stimulating proper expression and goes farther than Clark in discussing the relative importance of elements within the group. The highly important distinction between "what has just been mentioned" and "new Idea" which Whately had noted[24]

[16] *Foundations of Expression*, p. 127.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 50.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 92.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 96.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 108.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 111.

[22] S. H. Clark, *Interpretation of the Printed Page* (Chicago, 1915); James A. Winans, *Public Speaking* (Ithaca, 1915). See also Winans' *Speech-Making* (New York, 1938).
[23] *Public Speaking*, p. 443.
[24] Whately, p. 357. One of the best and earliest statements of this distinction is that by Alexander Bell in *The Practical Elocutionist* (1835): "There will always be some word or words more necessary to be understood than others. Those things which have been previously stated, or which are necessarily implied, or with which we assume our hearers to have

sensus of modern usage. We can make a scientific study of enough representative speakers to warrant the formulation of specific descriptions of the normal expression of various types of meaning. Such an attempt should be as respectable a linguistic study as any other. If "Study nature" has any valid meaning, it is just this. Certainly we cannot discover the normal pattern of English speech merely by studying our own nature, by following our impulses, or encouraging individual self-expression, or what Curry called "revelation of the soul." Such a method says in effect that once you have the meaning of a sentence there is nothing to learn about elocution; there is nothing to study; all you need to do is let yourself go. It implies also that the teacher has nothing to teach. The investigation of elocution cannot be impulsive or subjective but must be objective or, as Rush said, a speaker's elocution "should accord with the habitual perception of his audience." It must be derived from observation and analysis of the speech of representative speakers.

Some teachers believe that there neither is nor should be a standard pattern of expression. But when they try to demonstrate their belief they always choose for illustration a sentence which is doubtful or ambiguous in meaning, and fail to distinguish between a standard meaning of a given statement and a standard expression of a given meaning. The expression of plain thought does not vary materially among cultured speakers. In such a line as Hamlet's "Oh, what a rogue and peasant slave am I," two actors, intending to convey the same feeling, may vary somewhat in the emotional color they give the lines and especially in the depth of their feeling, and their readings may differ in pitch and tempo, but they will agree in expressing the plain sense of the line. The main stresses must be on "rogue," "peasant," and "slave," not on "what," "and," or "am." This assumes, of course, that the actors are bent upon communicating meaning, not on self-exploitation.

Some also object to any *description* of the pattern of expression as being mechanical, and therefore bad, and fail to distinguish between description and prescription. But if one has a thing to say and wishes to say it well, there should be no objection to designing what seems to be the best method of saying it, instead of merely blurting it out in its raw state. And if this involves some attention to the mechanics of expression, that is better than leaving expression to chance. What we seek, of course, is to make correct expression habitual, or "natural," but while the habit is being formed, and even afterward, attention to details may be necessary. If a student cannot discover for himself the normal expression of a passage, and if his teacher cannot lead him to the discovery of it, then it is surely good pedagogy for the teacher to prescribe it, in whatever terms he finds effective. This is not substituting mechanics for thought, for it is surely possible, and generally desirable, to attend both to what one is saying and how one is saying it.

It is time we stopped attempting to create an arbitrary distinction between natural and mechanical methods and imputing all virtue to one and all error to the other. And it is time we gave up the attempt to evolve good elocution "from within outward" and began to examine the speech in current use around us. Already our neglect of this our proper province has left the field open for others, and the phoneticians are fast moving in to occupy it. Since the quality of a vowel changes with loss of stress they have a legitimate in-

terest in where the stress is placed. This leads to a study of syllable duration and inflection, and so on to intonation pattern.

Many of the theories and principles set forth by phoneticians are of great interest and value to teachers of elocution. Kenyon's *American Pronunciation*[28] has useful explanations of the nature and location of stress in certain combinations of words. He finds that certain combinations regularly have approximately even stress, as in *James Brown, New England, apple pie, fall down,* etc. The same even stress is found in such combinations as verb plus adverb (He *went far*), adjective plus noun (*long days*), subject plus noun (The *trees* are *maples*). H. O. Coleman presumes to have discovered the distinction between emphasis of prominence and emphasis of intensity[29] and defines the intonation pattern of each. Studies in intonation are numerous,[30] though the usefulness of most of them is hindered by the inordinately complicated and conflicting systems of markings devised to indicate intonation.

Any field of study worthy of a place in a college curriculum should be progressively expanded and enriched by gradual accretions from those scholars and writers who have dealt with it. The field of elocution, unfortunately, has not experienced any such growth. Very few of the modern writers of textbooks pay any attention to what has been learned by their predecessors. Many treat the subject as though it had been newly created by their own efforts. One recent text on oral reading contains not a single reference to any previous writer on the subject. It would seem that a competent scholar in any field ought at least to know his predecessors, if only to confute them. In part this negligence may be due to a perverted conception of art which assumes that an artist (and we flatter ourselves that we *are* artists) is blessed with a divine inspiration and doesn't need to study anything, or know anything. Even if we are unwilling to perceive that an artist must draw his inspiration from close study of what he would represent, rather than from heaven, we can hardly escape the truth that one can learn what good speech is only by studying good speech. Or if we assume that anyone will speak well if he only understands what he is saying and utters it naturally, we must assume that all are alike in ability, all equally competent in speech, and hence all are above any need for study or instruction. The only alternative would seem to be that everyone may speak as he likes, but in this case, too, there would be no need for instruction.

Teachers of speech have been trying to teach oral communication without adequate knowledge of the vocal patterns by which communication takes place. What is probably needed in our training is a basic course in elocution, prerequisite to courses in public speaking, interpretation, acting, and speech correction. But before it is established, we should have a great many objective scientific studies of the vocal expression of representative speakers, attempting to discover and define the standard or normal pattern of cultivated English speech. The determination of that norm is the essential task of elocution.

[28] John S. Kenyon, *American Pronunciation*, 10th ed. (Ann Arbor, 1950).

[29] H. O. Coleman, "Intonation and Emphasis," *Miscellanea Phonetica* (London, 1914), p. 7.

[30] See, for instance, George L. Trager and Henry L. Smith, "An Outline of English Structure," *Studies in Linguistics* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1951); Kenneth L. Pike, "The Intonation of American English," *University of Michigan Publications in Linguistics* (Ann Arbor, 1945); Daniel Jones, *An Outline of English Phonetics*, 3d ed. (New York, 1932); and R-M. S. Heffner, *General Phonetics* (Madison, Wis., 1952).

# DISCUSSION IN PARLIAMENT AND FRANCIS BACON

Karl R. Wallace

STUDENTS of rhetoric who concentrate on the English Renaissance have had much to say about the principles, practice, and teaching of speechmaking in the days of Elizabeth and James, 1558-1625. They have had almost nothing to tell us about another form of oral communication, discussion and conference. Doubtless they have ignored the form because the writings of the Renaissance have little to say about the processes of arriving at group decisions through systematic colloquy. The men of Elizabeth spoke eloquently and they talked much about eloquence, little of discussion as such. The principal reason for this state of affairs was that parliamentary debate had by no means stabilized and regularized its forms and procedures in Elizabeth's reign, 1558-1603. These years were the late adolescent age of parliamentary debate. The reign of James I, 1603-1625, saw parliamentary discussion take on a sort of green, rather than ripe, maturity. Discussion was stimulated principally because the struggle between divine kingship and popular, representative government came to a focus, although not to a climax, under James. The chief sign of emerging parliamentary maturity is probably seen in the growth and stability of the committee, for it is in committee procedures that discussion rather than speechmaking controls decisions.

Francis Bacon seems to stand unique among the men of our period. He was the only great personality to combine the interests and activities of cyclopedist and theorist on communication and rhetoric with the practical experience of political speaker and participant in conference. In the *Advancement of Learning* and its expanded Latin translation, *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, he took all knowledge as his intellectual province and presented a systematic, consistent chart of the fields of learning, in which he found a significant and essential place for the arts and sciences of language in general, and for grammar, rhetoric, and logic in particular. His experience in nine parliaments of Elizabeth and James embraced 36 years, 1584-1621, from his entry as ordinary citizen to his emergence and fall as Lord Chancellor, Viscount St. Albans. If we may judge from the respect and confidence he enjoyed in the House of Commons as orator from the floor, as reporter of their business and their King's, and as participant in scores of committee sessions, he was extremely active and effective in political deliberation. Out of that experience, as a man of theory and a man of action, Bacon distilled some observations on group discussion which, so far as I can discover, are unique to his day.

How much influence, if any, Bacon exerted on parliamentary customs it is hard to say. Conversely, one cannot say confidently how much impact his ex-

*Karl R. Wallace, Chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Illinois, is a former editor of* QJS *and a former president of SAA. His* Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric *is an essential work in Renaissance and rhetorical scholarship. The present article is a companion piece to his "Aspects of Modern Rhetoric in Francis Bacon,"* QJS, *December, 1956.*

perience in parliament made upon his thought and writings. Nevertheless, his observations assume depth when viewed in the context of his experience. Our abstractions, T. S. Eliot once wrote, are likely to have their objective correlatives.

Most of Bacon's observations, practical in nature, appear in the essays, "Of Discourse," "Of Dispatch," and "Of Counsel." A few remarks, largely theoretical, occur in the *Advancement of Learning*. To me it is significant that the essay on discourse, together with those on faction and negotiation (three of the ten essays in the first edition, 1597) were probably shaped during Bacon's early parliamentary years.[1] Although not published until 1607, the *Advancement* was undergoing final composition during the last two of Elizabeth's parliaments and the first two of James's, when parliament was more active than it ever had been. The essays on dispatch and counsel first appeared in the 1612 edition of the essays. When he wrote to Henry, Prince of Wales, about them, Bacon was aware of their chief inspiration. The essays are, he said, "of a nature, whereof a man shall find much in experience, litle in bookes; so they are neither repeticons nor fansies."[2] In 1607 Bacon became Solicitor General, and the duties of that office may have gradually shifted his primary allegiance from the Commons to the Crown.[3]

One does not fully grasp Bacon's pronouncements on political discussion and conference except in the context of parliamentary activity.[4] We shall turn now to the chief features of parliamentary discussion as exemplified by the committees of the House of Commons. With some knowledge of committee activity as a frame of reference, we can then present Bacon's observations on group discussion.

[1] How long before publication Bacon had been formulating his "conceits" is impossible to determine precisely. In the dedicatory epistle to his brother, he says merely that "they passed long agoe from my pen. . . ." *The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. J. Spedding, R. L. Ellis, and D. D. Heath (London, 1876-1883), VI, 523.

[2] Richard Whately, *Bacon's Essays With Annotations* (Boston and New York, 1875), pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

[3] On Bacon's activities in the Parliamentary session of 1606-1607, Willson remarks: "Bacon's position was a rather anomalous one. On most points he stood for the Crown and spoke in the House with the purpose of gaining favor at Court. Yet at the same time he enjoyed the confidence and regard of the Commons in a high degree and was constantly employed by them upon committees and in conferences. He was therefore not a leader but a mediator, forever seeking a compromise between King and Commons." *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607* (Minneapolis and London, 1931), p. xxi.

[4] For knowledge of parliamentary customs, especially of committee procedures and deliberations, we have to depend upon such records as the 24-volume "Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England" extending from the earliest times to 1660, the *Journals of the House of Commons* from 1547 onward, Sir Simonds D'Ewes and Hayward Townshend's collections of the journals of Queen Elizabeth's parliaments. Especially valuable, when extant, are the records of the clerks of the House of Commons. The most complete such record I have encountered is *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, 1606-1607* (Minneapolis and London, 1931), ed. David H. Willson. Professor Wallace Notestein's work as editor of the journals of the Stuart parliaments is of course well known. Sometimes one turns up first-hand reports from such manuscript collections as the Lansdowne, Stowe, and Cotton. From the labors of scholars, one finds other original materials, along with some interpretation and comment. J. E. Neale's *The Elizabethan House of Commons* (London, 1949) is invaluable; so also is the earliest of contemporary accounts I have found, John Vowell's *The Order and Usage of the Keeping of a Parliament . . .*, probably published in 1575. The study by William Wallace, *Sir Edwin Sandys and the First Parliament of James I* (Philadelphia, 1940), and John Hatsell's four-volume work, *Precedents and Proceedings in the House of Commons* (London, 1796), are often helpful in understanding committee customs. Of the many other general sources which have been of assistance, I shall mention but four here: William Hakewill, *Modus tenendi Parliamentum* (London, 1660), Edward Porritt's *The Unreformed House of Commons*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1909), Joseph Redlich's three-volume history called *The Procedure of the House of Commons* (London, 1907), and Henry Scobell, *Memorials of the Method and Manner of Proceedings in Parliament in Passing Bills* (London, 1670).

## I

During Bacon's time, the committees of the House of Commons took over the chief burden of discussion and deliberation. By about the 1620's, motions, bills, and petitions received their fullest discussion in committee rather than on the floor of the House. In the reigns of Elizabeth and James, a bill normally went through three readings, and at the second reading, a good deal of informed debate could—and sometimes did—take place.[5] In 1607, if we may accept the observation of the House Clerk, Bowyer, "important" matters were discussed at the second reading: ". . . by the Custome of the House, Matters of Importance are to be discussed openly in the House before the same be committed; and so was this Bill [*re* draining of the Fenns] argued in the open House, and Ordered That Councell was for the Bill as against it shall be heard in the House on Wednesday next, and in the meane tyme it was not committed."[6] The tendency to curtail House debate seems to have disturbed Bacon as early as 1600! "We have turned out divers Bills without Disputation: and for a House of Wisdom and gravity as this is, to bandy Bills like Balls, and to be silent as if no Body were of counsel with the Common-Wealth is unfitting."[7]

Nevertheless, at the second stage most bills were referred to committee. Referral was partly for the purpose of amendment, partly for the purpose of securing fuller debate than the House as a whole could manage efficiently. One observer in 1621 remarked that "few matters are debated in the House, but are referred to a committee and there debated." The same observer saw clearly that the growing amount and diversity of legislation made impossible any return to "the old course of debating matters" at second reading.[8] Scobell reports that there were at least five Standing Committees in the early 17th century, to which were referred matters of religion, privileges and elections, grievances, conduct of the courts of justice, and trade and commerce.[9] Bowyer reports that in James's parliament of 1605, the House employed at least thirty-three committees, most of them in the "select" or special category.[10]

Doubtless the gradual transfer of debate to committee was prompted by forces other than the increasing number and complexity of bills. A member could speak in the House but once to a bill or a substantive amendment.[11] In the House committee he could participate as freely as he liked.[12] Free participation encouraged frequent question and answer, the brief exchange, and the short "speech." Participants occasionally speak of the "short arguments" in committee. Apparently the long speech had little place, for in one meeting in 1601 when Sir Walter Raleigh had obviously started off on an eloquent speech, a Mr. Wiseman broke in: "Let us draw to some head and leave our orations and speeches. We are to consider all what is fit to be gained. . . . I will be bold enough to

[5] Consult Neale for the stages of reading, pp. 369-373. Cf. Sir Thomas Smith's sketch of procedure as presented by G. M. F. Campion, *An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons* (London, 1929), p. 17.

[6] *Bowyer's Diary*, p. 254.

[7] *Parl. Hist.*, IV, 437.

[8] See Neale, p. 378.

[9] Campion, p. 22.

[10] *Bowyer's Diary*, p. xi.

[11] Just how firm was the rule and to what it applied is not always clear. Vowell, sitting in Parliament, 13th Elizabeth, 1571, declares: ". . .but having once spoken to any Bil: he may speak no more for that time." (Vowell, p. 32.) In 1604, Bacon, having spoken twice, was not allowed to speak a third time. (Hatsell, II, 96.)

[12] In commenting on House rules against a member's speaking too often, Hatsell observes: "It is to allow more ample and frequent discussion than this order will admit, that a Committee is instituted, where every member may speak as often as he pleases. . . ." (Hatsell, II, 99-100.)

deliver my opinion first because someone must break the Ice."[13] One is reminded, of course, of Bacon's observation that eloquent speechmakers aren't necessarily effective in group discussion. "Long and curious speeches," Bacon wrote, are about as useful in discussion "as a robe or mantle with a long train" is in a race. One is reminded, also, of Bacon's desire to see the art of discussion and conversation given "better inquiry" and study than it had received. And as an art to be investigated systematically it could be fostered either as a branch of rhetoric or of political science ("policy").

The committees of this period, like committees today, collected information and applied their knowledge in argument. One of the standard modes of obtaining information, then as now, was the hearing of witnesses and their lawyers, especially when private bills were being considered. Probably Bacon had the hearing in mind when in his essay "Of Counsel" he remarks that "let such as are to inform counsel out of their particular professions (as lawyers, seaman, and the like . . .) be first heard before committees . . . and let them not come in multitudes or in a tribunitious manner; for that is to clamour counsels, not to inform them."[14] Although he does not comment pointedly, Bacon was also doubtless aware of the problem of evaluating evidence. The lobby, the logographer, the bribe, the statement prepared by the expert and read by the witness—these and other tactics—were well known to Elizabethan committees. At least one sharp member of a committee in 1585 knew well that he preferred original, direct testimony to that offered by a lawyer and perhaps prepared by someone other than the speaker. He phrased his preference thus: "He that spake first . . . his tale deserves the less credit, because I can show it him in writing, for he hath it from the searchers . . . I prefer the clothier before the searcher, and the truth before them both."[15]

The scope and activity of the committee can only be hinted at here. Roughly classifying its business as public and private bills, the committee might consider problems such as the transportation of beer or the current evils of the monopoly on wine (held at one time by Sir Walter Raleigh); it was concerned about a husband for Elizabeth and the price James paid to farmers for his food stuffs (purveyance); it paid heed to attempts to silence dissenting ministers and to its own privileges of freedom of utterance and freedom from arrest.

At least three committee customs provide further insight into the character of discussion and debate. First, any member of the House had the privilege of attending any committee session. Furthermore, like any member of a committee, he could speak as often as he wished. The result was that a committee by the end of James's reign could consist of 60 to 150 persons, a considerable increase from the average of eight persons in Henry VIII's reign. The size suggests strongly that members were interested rather than uninterested in legislation. And a sizable number of participants, of course, can mean a thorough canvass of all points of view, as well as wide dissemination of information. The second custom probably encouraged respect for relevance and point, and perhaps promoted some taste for logical rather than emotional thought. The custom was inherent in two of the requirements which were met by a committee report to the House proper. By about the middle of James's reign, the

[13] *Parl. Hist.*, IV, 439.
[14] *Works* VI, 427.
[15] Neale, p. 387.

House stipulated that reports from its committees must always contain reasons for their recommendations as well as the substance of the recommendation itself.[16] The third custom was the preparation by the committee or one of its members of a written brief or epitome of amendments or other changes in a bill. The speaker of the House habitually used the brief in indicating the substance of the bill prior to its reading by the Clerk. It would seem that these two characteristics of the committee report afforded practical and workable goals of discussion. Bacon's only specific comment on reporting relates to the selection of the reporter himself: "In choice of instruments, it is better to choose men of a plainer sort that will like to do that that is committed to them, and to report back again faithfully the success, than those who are cunning to contrive out of other men's business somewhat to grace themselves, and will help the matter in report for satisfaction sake."[17]

A third requirement of committees probably also helped to give direction and order to discussion; at least it served to keep committees from rendering independent and final decisions in the name of the House and of failing to report upon their deliberations. As early as 1573, John Vowell (sometimes called John Hooker) wrote that "When any Bil is committed, the committees have not authoritie to conclude: but onely to order reforme, examin, and amend the thing committed unto them and of their dooings they must give reporte to the house again, by whome the Bill is to be considered."[18] Such a regulation was well understood by the end of Elizabeth's reign and closely adhered to, although Vowell's testimony suggests that during the early part of her reign the point needed making.

## II

Another kind of committee with which Bacon accumulated considerable experience during his parliamentary career was the joint or conference committee of the Lords and Commons. This device for adjusting conflicting legislation of the two houses came of age during Bacon's time. It reached maturity considerably later—perhaps 50 years later—than the House committee did. The members of either house could meet among themselves upon fairly even terms, socially and educationally. But a joint meeting brought together social strata as different as lords, bishops, and judges on the one hand, and knights, burgesses, and ordinary citizens on the other. Since Bacon took part directly in the development of the conference committee, we should understand what was going on.

The term "conference" was employed during the period to designate certain features of regularized discussion between Lords and Commons. The features: (1) each house selected a few of its members, the Commons, in James's reign, having the right to name two members to the Lords' one; (2) under well-defined circumstances, members sought and gave information, argued

[16] *Bowyer's Diary*, pp. 291, 378. The importance of the oral report to centuries of parliamentary deliberation can hardly be overvalued. Bacon was often selected as reporter and seems to have met high standards of accuracy, conciseness, and clarity. On one occasion, May 15, 1606, when Bacon reported back to the Commons what he had said in introducing their grievances to King James, his account was apparently the full text of what he said: "And so repeated his owne Speech used to the King before he did reade the Grievance, which was an Eloquent Speech, which was not long, yet impossible for me, or any man to take in such sorte as he delivered the Same." (*Ibid.*, p. 165.) On another occasion when Bacon reported to the House on a conference with the Lords, Bowyer fared better. (*Ibid.*, pp. 323-324.)

[17] *Works* VI, 493.

[18] Vowell, facing p. 34.

back and forth, and where possible came to agreement through compromise; and (3) any decisions arrived at had to be reported to both houses for final action.

Legislators during the period were self-consciously aware of what a conference entailed. It was not a "meeting"! In 1623, Sir Edwyn Sandys was pricked to criticism when a messenger from the Lords requested a "meeting." "If we give them a Meeting," he said, "we give them an Audience, and no Conference."[19] In 1626, the Commons asked the Lords for a "conference," but the Lords thought a conference inappropriate and requested a meeting. In his *Precedents and Proceedings in the House of Commons,* Hatsell is probably right in saying that "conference" always meant that both parties took part in discussion.[20] In 1606, when the House was disturbed by the over-zealous suppression of non-conformist ministers, Bacon himself made a procedural proposal which touched off an exchange that Bowyer records thus:

SIR FRA[NCIS] BACON moved touching the Conference to be had on Thursday with the Lords That the Committees maie first meete and conferre, Allso for asmuch as in his opinion the conference is not to rest meerely upon proposicions of the Lords but the Committees appointed to conferre do likewise propose to their Lordships: their[fore] he wished that some might be sent to their Lordships to signifie so much and to desier that their Committees maie come authorised accordinglie: and that this howse would be pleased to authorise the Committees for the conference to propose as well as to heare, and to direct them what and how to propose, for said he otherwise if they shall only heare what the Lords will saie this is not conference:[21]

The Speaker was prompted to remark: ". . . it will not be amisse that unto certaine selected persons be appointed what they every one handle and speake unto, not restraining anie other of the Committees." Whereupon a Doctor Perkins observed: ". . . that wee ought allso to propound otherwise it weare no conference but a reference."[22] The exchange recorded here implicitly reveals the scope of participation in the conference committee. Prior to the last years of Elizabeth the conference was either a "hearing" of one side by the other, or an exchange of formal speeches by persons appointed and instructed by each house.[23] By the middle of James's reign, the conference, although still organized, permitted anyone to speak.

The customary occasion for a conference committee appeared when one house amended a bill that the other house had passed, the house of origin refusing to accept the amendment without adjustment. The first mention by D'Ewes of a joint committee (whether "conference" or "meeting" is not indicated) is March 3, 1558.[24] The Lords had sent a bill back to Commons with some "provisos" attached. Commons wanted to eliminate one proviso, and so asked for, and was granted, a conference. In the same year the Act of Supremacy received full debate in each house and in a series of joint conferences.[25] The chief object of the conference, then, was to adjust conflicting legislation. In fact, the Commons could insist upon the point, as is evident in Bowyer's report of a House altercation in 1606, when someone suggested a joint committee with the Lords to prepare a bill: "It was affirmed to be contrary to the custome and usage of this howse to ioine in drawing anie bill but that every

[19] Hatsell, IV, 26.
[20] *Ibid.*, note.
[21] *Bowyer's Diary*, p. 24.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[23] See Wallace, especially pp. 29-31.
[24] *Journals of All the Parliaments during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth; both of the . . . Lords and . . . Commons, collected by Sir Simonds d'Ewes . . . revised and published by Paul Bowes* (London, 1682), p. 21.
[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

bill ought to be drawen and passed in one of the howses and sent to the other."[26] Another member even disavowed a possible precedent! Especially on bills of revenue and supply, the Commons were loath to hold preliminary conferences with the Lords. We learn from the *Parliamentary History*, 1593, that the Lords suggested an exploratory meeting, Commons sent the suggestion to committee, the committee reported favorably, but the whole House, despite the influence of Robert Cecil and Bacon, rejected its committee's recommendation, 128-217.[27]

Time and circumstances, however, brought occasions when the joint conference was used to test temper and attitude, to pool information, and to secure preliminary agreement on crucial points. In March, 1605, the Commons were hard at work on a bill designed to redress some of the evils springing from the Crown's practice of obtaining foodstuffs and other living supplies directly from the farmer and producer. Both houses were worried about two issues: Could they question the King's right to the practice without appearing to question his prerogatives? Should they object only to the confiscatory prices set by his agents? Confronted with such tender matters, the Lords suggested a conference. The Commons agreed, and ceased work on their bill.[28] Eventually Commons sent a committee to confer with the Lords on the issue of prices. The *Parliamentary History* reports a similar situation, also in 1605. Again the Commons stopped their deliberations, accepted the Lords' proposal for conference, with the result that "several Meetings of the Committees of both Houses were had about it; the Result of all was, the passing of two new acts."[29] In trying to speed up discussion of the Union of Scotland and England, Bacon himself remarked in Commons:

> Whether it be to be carried severally in the houses or by conference? I incline to the latter: because it is a matter of state, a matter of future providence, and not of present feeling. Our state is good now, and therefore to see what it may be, let us take help of those who sitting on higher ground by such advantage have the further prospect to see more. . . .
> If then Conference, the question is where to begin. *Dies diem docet.* Imitate yourselves in the last great bill of Recusants (provided always it be not so long). That was to make one Church, this to make one Nation. Then we made a selected Committee to prepare: so did the Lords: and our labours fell all out with that consent, that when the King's letter came from Royston, it made a unison; and therefore I wish this should have the like course.[30]

In December, 1661, the two houses appointed a joint committee to examine, during Parliament's recess, any designs "to disturb the union and peace of the kingdom." This seems to set up an investigating group. Hatsell thinks that the device was invented to secure common evidence and testimony and thus prevent misunderstanding which might arise if each house investigated separately.[31]

In preparing his essay, "Of Counsel," for the 1612 edition of the essays, Bacon took occasion to look back on his experience with committees. He commends the labors of the committee which dealt with the Union, and permits himself a general observation:

> The counsels at this day in most places are but familiar meetings, where matters are rather talked on than debated. It were better that in causes of weight, the matters were propounded one day and not spoken to till the next day. . . . So it was done in the Commission of Union

[26] *Bowyer's Diary*, p. 57.
[27] IV, 381 *seq.*
[28] *Bowyer's Diary*, pp. 57-58.
[29] *Parl. Hist.*, V, 145-146.
[30] *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon including All His Occasional Works* . . ., collected and edited by James Spedding (London, 1861-1874), III, 304.
[31] Hatsell, III, 34.

between England and Scotland; which was a grave and orderly assembly.[32]

In conference with the Lords, the Commons seem to have held their own. They might appear at a disadvantage in some ways, it is true. The Lords could set the time and place of the conference. The Commons members had to stand, and the Lords could sit. Sometimes the Commons delegation had to stand around a long time before the Lords arrived, and the legs of older persons might give way. Occasionally the Lords would try to dominate discussion, and doubtless succeeded. About one case, at least, Fuller complained pretty caustically on the floor of the House that "The Lords both conferr, and set as Moderators, for when they please, the Kings Counsell and Iudges overrule us with their Censure, and when we desire the Opinion of the Iudges it is denyed." In referring again to the judges, some of whom traditionally sat as legal counsellors in the Lords, Fuller alluded to their proper role: "at Conferences, they sitt as Assistants, not as Iudges."[33]

But the Commons had their advantage also. By the early years of James's reign, almost all bills—and certainly the important ones, such as the money and subsidy bills—originated in the Commons. The Lords often waited for work to do, and if they changed a bill, they had to lead in asking for a conference and theirs was the burden of proof. The Commons were free to refuse a conference, and they often did. If they granted a conference, they were superior numerically; for by late in James's reign, they outnumbered the Lords, two to one, on the joint committee. Moreover, Commons members learned a delaying tactic to offset the surprise situation in which the Lords had superior information and preparation. In effect they would say politely: We understood only that the general matter would be discussed, not the specific points. Or, we expected only to listen and report, not to dispute. In such cases, they would excuse themselves, go back to the House for instructions and information, and resume the conference later. In one case when the conference was upon the naturalization of the Scots, at the time of the Union, Commons members returned to the House for instructions. As debate started, the House proposed to instruct its conference members, for the reason which Sir Herbert Croft advanced on the floor:

> I thinck That before Conference, it will be convenient that among our Selves wee consider of the Matter of Convenience, and this to be in the House, not by Committees; For as I doe confesse that in Committees by short Arguments many times truth is beaten out, yet I have observed, That in Committees when every man may reply, some special Persons of Place by Speaking often, and [by] countenance doe prevaile more then by their reasons.[34]

Furthermore, in instances of significant legislation, the Commons could hold out for the compromise they wanted. One example makes this convincingly clear. The joint conference was over one of many bills in James's times directed at the non-conformists, principally the Catholics. The Lords, more tolerant than the Commons, wished to give persons plenty of time to meet the communion requirements in the Established Church, but the Commons bill called for a short time and stringent penalties. In a letter to the Earl of Mar, the Earl of Salisbury cites the reasons the Lords had used in debate to maintain their position, and concludes: "Neverthelesse because the bill had many other excellent parts, which wee were loath to ov-

[32] *Works* VI, 426.
[33] *Bowyer's Diary*, p. 158.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

erthrowe, wee consented in the end to appoint a punishment upon the non-Communicant."[35]

## III

Thus we have before us the objective correlative of Bacon's views on political discussion. We can now turn to his observations on conference and counsel, the working of committees, and, broadly speaking, the management of talk in small groups. Bacon did not employ such modern terms as "group discussion" or "group dynamics," but he had their processes in mind.

Out of his experience in political discussion, Bacon concluded that oratory and discussion in some respects involve different skills. A speaker, he said, should be able to mould and fit his "proof and persuasions" in keeping with his auditors. Such application, says Bacon in an echo from Plato's *Phaedrus*, ought ideally "to extend so far, that if a man should speak of the same thing to several persons, he should speak to them all respectively and several ways."[36] This ability the greatest orators often lack, for they have been ensnared by "their well-graced forms of speech." In offering this observation, Bacon is talking about rhetoric. Yet what we think of as discussion and conversation clearly intrigues him, for he turns aside and names this readiness and skill in speaking appropriately to persons, the *"politic part of eloquence in private speech."*[37] He wants it to receive "better inquiry" and study than it had hitherto enjoyed. And within his scheme of the arts, although he is willing to see it a part of either rhetoric or political science ("policy"), I believe he preferred to see discussion keep company with politics. After all, "discretion of speech is more than eloquence; and to speak agreeably to him with whom we deal, is more than to speak in good words or in good order."[38]

Most of Bacon's observations are more practical than theoretical. Sometimes he is concerned with the method and plan of conference and discussion; more often he is interested in general advice and specific precept for the participant.

As for plan, method, and order in discussion, these contribute more to efficiency of discourse than anything else: "order, distribution, and singling out of parts, is the life of dispatch." Furthermore, in the public discussion of any problem, there are always "three parts of business: the preparation, the debate or examination, and the perfection." Preparation is best undertaken by relatively few persons. Debate over proposals and policies is appropriate to many persons. The shaping of details, the final touches, are also "the work of few."

The fundamental advice to the participant is to seek out what is true, to cultivate judgment and discernment about "what should be thought" on the problem at hand. It is better to contribute a sound and true argument than it is to assemble an armory of all possible arguments with which to make ready show of one's intelligence and "wit." In expressing this opinion, Bacon is clearly saying that the Elizabethan schoolboy practice of commonplacing and thememaking is no more useful to discussion than to speechmaking. "Some have certain common places and themes wherein they are good, and want variety; which kind of poverty is for the

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 161n.

[36] *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, *Works* IV, 457-458.

[37] *Advancement of Learning*, *Works* III, 411.

[38] Unless otherwise noted, all quotations below are from the essays "Of Counsel," *Works* VI, 423-427; "Of Dispatch," *Ibid.*, 434-435; "Of Discourse," *Ibid.*, 455-457; "Of Negociating," *Ibid.*, 492-494.

most part tedious, and when it is once perceived, ridiculous." "The honourablest part of talk," Bacon reminds us, is to keep in accord with the occasion, to respect the reasonable limits of the point at hand and then "to pass on to somewhat else; for [thus] a man leads the dance."

Such observations on the politic part of eloquence are general in nature, in keeping with Bacon's ranging, inclusive mind. But he does not entirely overlook the specific precept. To encourage dispatch, he remarks, there is nothing like keeping the issue in the open: "there is no such gain of time as to iterate often the state of the question." Frequent iteration of this kind not only supplies appropriate emphasis to the issue; it also discourages "long and curious speeches." Furthermore, keeping attention on the issue puts a damper on elaborate devices of introducing an argument, of managing artful transitions, and of addressing complimentary references "to the person."

To give final flavor to Bacon's precepts on discussion I shall be content with the following, for the most part expressed in the Lord Chancellor's own language. "He that questioneth much, shall learn much, and content much; but especially if he apply his questions to the skill of the persons whom he asketh; for he shall give them occasion to please themselves in speaking, and himself shall continually gather knowledge." But let him not, however, ask questions that are "troublesome"; for he may only seem like a professional examiner. "And let him be sure to leave other men their turns to speak." There is no place in discussion for the bluffer, if for no other reason than that he is almost bound to be caught by his own bluff: "If you dissemble sometimes your knowledge of that you are thought to know, you shall be thought another time to know that you know not." Nor is there place in discussion for the egotistical creature, who, by direct or indirect means, must serve his own vanity. "Speech of a man's self ought to be seldom, and well chosen." The sharp retort, the sarcastic and satirical thrust are personal matters, not material. "Speech of touch towards others should be sparingly used; for discourse ought to be as a field, without coming home to any man." Our last example of Bacon's precepts is perhaps directed to some harassed chairman: "If there be any that would reign and take up all the time, let him find means to take him off."

In the essay, "Of Counsel," although Bacon is primarily interested in advising King James, he is not unmindful of general implications. Indeed, in this essay, he is occasionally drawing upon his parliamentary experience. He feels, for example, that counsels (i.e., small deliberative groups) have become too familiar and informal; there is too much mere talk and not enough debate. Decisions are taken and carried out much too rapidly. He is concerned, too, about the choice of persons who comprise committees. His main concern he voices thus: "In choice of committees for ripening business for the counsel, it is better to choose indifferent persons, than to make an indifferency by putting in those that are strong on both sides."

Possibly Bacon's willingness to place discussion, as an art, within the orbit of politics was influenced by his long service on committees and counsels. Out of the same experience, also, probably emerged his practical observations and advice on the conduct and management of group discussion when persons combine to undertake a political task. He distilled his experience into aphorisms for the more efficient conduct of the public business.

# ADULTERY ANALYZED: THE HISTORY OF *THE STRANGER*

Myron Matlaw

## I

THE plays of August von Kotzebue, if mentioned at all, are usually dismissed by historians of the drama as harbingers of a temporary social madness. The years 1798-1801 (some allow the later date 1802) comprise a period which has been debunked for many years as the "Kotzebue rage." Kotzebue's plays and their remarkable histories are almost totally unknown today, although they were performed with unprecedented success across the western world from St. Petersburg to San Francisco, from the end of the eighteenth until well past the middle of the nineteenth century. In England and America they held the stage for about a hundred years and were repeatedly performed by the greatest actors of the age. Playing to crowded and enthusiastic audiences in these countries they became, for some years, the sole barrier against the bankruptcy Richard Brinsley Sheridan faced at Drury Lane and William Dunlap faced at the New York Park Theatre. They were attacked by Byron, Carlyle, Coleridge, and Scott; they were defended by Hazlitt and Hunt; and they deeply aroused the ire of Hannah More and a host of professional patriots and moralists.

Kotzebue's were probably the first successful modern plays to employ the devices and to contain the combination of elements upon which subsequent English and American popular drama, including that of today, has been based. The immediate purpose of this study, however, is to shed a little more light on the interesting theatrical and sociological milieu of a period in dramatic history too little known and too seldom examined. The dramatic criticism, the modes of acting, and changes in the popular tastes of the period may well be illustrated by the history of *Menschenhass und Reue* (1789) and *Die Spanier in Peru* (1795) which, as *The Stranger* (1798) and *Pizarro* (1799), were Kotzebue's most successful plays in England and America.

*Myron Matlaw is a member of the Department of English of the New Jersey State Teachers College at Paterson. A similar article on the theatrical history of Kotzebue's* Pizarro *will appear in a later number of* QJS.

## II

*The Stranger* is a well-constructed sentimental drama. Sheridan's few but effective changes in Kotzebue's play[1] emphasize the sentimentality of the plot and focus attention on the sin—Mrs. Haller's adultery—and the repentance, the misanthropy or *Weltschmerz* of the Stranger, and the final reconciliation of husband and wife. As stated in the long and enthusiastic review of the 24 March 1798 première in the *Times*:

> The principal excellence of the Play arises from the exact correspondence of the thoughts with the passions which actuate the *Stranger* and *Mrs. Haller*. All the subordinate and adventitious ideas are derived from the great source of action, the wife's infidelity. They receive the

[1] Sheridan's alterations were made in Benjamin Thompson's translation (1798), which constitutes the basic text of the acting editions of the play. It was first published in Thompson's *The German Theatre*, I (London, 1800), an edition which contains but a few of the Sheridan changes which were incorporated in later editions of the Thompson series. A recent reprint of the play may be found in Dougald MacMillan and Howard Mumford Jones, *Plays of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century* (1938).

stamp of originality from their just connection with the primary motive, and operate as forcibly as if the original cause were always in view.

His neighbours, Goethe remarked, "zerflossen in Tränen" during performances of this play;[2] English and American audiences were as strongly moved by *The Stranger*, as the "crowded houses, mute attention, weeping eyes, and ladies fainting"[3] repeatedly testified. The *Commercial Advertiser's* review of the American première of the play[4] remarked that "the effect of the pathetic scenes was beyond any former example within our remembrance," and later reviews, on both sides of the Atlantic, repeatedly call attention to the lachrymose qualities of the play. Leigh Hunt commented: "The very critics are shaken into tears; pity, white handkerchiefs, and genuine honest sorrow prevail all over the house."[5] Charlotte Cushman was fond of mimicking Louis Blanc's confession on the effect of her Mrs. Haller on him: "Miss Cushman, I assure you I never have c-r-i-e-d so much in all my life";[6] but the actress herself, like Mrs. Siddons before her,[7] could not but weep in sympathy with the character she was portraying. Another witness of her performance recalls:

> So powerful was this performance, so impressive was it, so much did it touch the sensibilities of the auditors, that I have known ladies to be removed from the theatre in hysterics, and have seen strong-framed and strong-brained men weeping like children.[8]

Reviews gave frequent testimony of the amazing effect of the sentimentality, particularly on audiences preponderantly feminine, and a bitter and damning—but now highly amusing—review of the play in the New York *Spirit of the Times* (28 April 1866) explained the cause for the tears (and the popularity of the play) by the ladies' dreadful fear "that some day they may (or may not) be Hallerized, and there is no warning like that of having an awful example before one's eyes."

The adultery and the final reconciliation, which evoked the greatest amount of tears, were criticized almost invariably throughout the history of the play. Mrs. Haller is neither the first nor the only stage heroine to have sinned, but she is one of the few who were not only forgiven but were also allowed to live at the end of the play.[9] *The Morning Chronicle* (26 March 1798) hailed her creation as being "a bold and in some measure a new attempt," and justified the happy ending:

> We see that she is still worthy to be loved; and we are forced to overcome the prejudice, which condemns the woman, who has been

[2] Quoted by Gerhard Stenger, *Goethe und August von Kotzebue* (Breslau, 1910), p. 61.

[3] *The Dramatic Censor*, 25 January 1800.

[4] The performance took place at the New York Park Theatre on 10 December 1798; it was reviewed in the next day's edition.

[5] *The Tatler*, 4 November 1830, reprinted in Leigh Hunt, *Dramatic Essays*, eds. William Archer and Robert W. Lowe (London, 1894), p. 175.

[6] Quoted by Emma Stebbins, *Charlotte Cushman, Her Letters and Memories of Her Life* (Boston, 1878), p. 57.

[7] Mrs. Siddons' daughter wrote: "My Mother cries so much at it that she is always ill when she comes home." Quoted by Mrs. Clement Parsons, *The Incomparable Siddons* (New York, 1909), p. 158.

[8] Clara Erskine Clement, *Charlotte Cushman* ("American Actor Series," Boston, 1882), p. 166.

[9] A modern example is Rosabella, the heroine of the musical play *The Most Happy Fella* (1956), the Amy of Sidney Howard's *They Knew What They Wanted* (1924) on which the musical is based. Cecilia, in Sophia Lee's *The Chapter of Accidents* (1780), is another one of the very few "sinning women" in serious dramatic literature who are allowed both to sin and to live happily ever after. The success of this play on the London stage, where it was performed as late as 1823, demonstrated the profitability of violating the almost ironclad rule which prevails to this date: a sinning woman may be the sympathetic heroine of a play, and she may be forgiven; but she must pay for her sins in the last act, usually with her life. After the success of Sophia Lee's play Sheridan was able to answer his scandalized critics, as the *Times* of 30 March 1798 quotes him to have answered, that "he had thought of *destroying* Mrs. HALLER, but he could not do it without *killing* the audience too."

guilty of one frailty, to hopeless exile from honour and esteem. We are, therefore, pleased with the prospect of the reconciliation of *Walbeck* and his wife. The progress of the story interests our sympathy, and its completion gratifies our wishes.

Disputations over the "edifying morality" of the play, highly praised in the *Times* of the same day, provided a great deal of gratuitous advertisement and helped to keep the public curious and interested. The play was customarily defended as being highly moral and of great beneficial effect to the public. Kotzebue himself, indignant at the charges of immorality made against the play, had used this defense repeatedly,[10] and many American and English reviewers echoed his words enthusiastically. The *Commercial Advertiser* (17 December 1798), discussing the "moral tendency" of this play, wrote: "If all plays were like this and if all audiences were equally attentive and susceptible, the question of the usefulness of the theatre might be easily decided—since no man who witnessed this play can hesitate a moment to admit that he came away a better man than he went." Anna Cora Mowatt, relating an experience in which a woman in her audience was dramatically dissuaded from committing adultery as she watched her, as Mrs. Haller, confessing it—an experience paralleling several cited by Kotzebue—concluded: "The representation of the Stranger was instrumental in saving at least one frail being from becoming 'Like stars that fall to rise no more.' "[11]

Among the attacks a full-length book, ominously entitled *Adultery Analyzed*, "endeavours to guard the reader" against the "seducing power" of *The Stranger* and *Pizarro*.[12] Hannah More, in her *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (1799), referred to *The Stranger* as "this first attempt at representing an adulteress in an exemplary light," and was shocked at the corruption of audiences who "are led by the art of the poet [Kotzebue] anxiously to wish to see an adulteress restored to that rank of women who have not violated the most solemn covenant that can be made with man, nor disobeyed one of the most positive laws which has been enjoined by God."[13] A reviewer of the *Times* (17 April 1815) even made a numerical estimate of the evil the play had perpetrated by being performed in Covent Garden alone, and concluded "that no less than 50,000 of that class of citizenship whose virtue is most essential to the state have been already exposed to the contagion of this canonized adultery."

The frequent attacks on the morality of the play, while primarily instrumental in further advertising it, did occasionally succeed in having controversial parts altered for the stage. Schink's published adaptation of the play,[14] which substitutes the intention for the act of adultery, was not used for

[10] See, for example, his "Vorbericht" to *Das Kind der Liebe*, and *Aus August von Kotzebues hinterlassenen Papieren* (Leipzing, 1821), pp. 11-12.

[11] *Autobiography of an Actress* (Boston, 1854), pp. 247-48.

[12] Philippus Philaretes, *Adultery Analyzed* (London, 1810), preface.

[13] *The Works of Hannah More*, V, (London, 1830), 32. Thomas Dutton, *The Dramatic Censor*, I (1800), 311, who was critical of both Kotzebue and Hannah More, answered this attack: "Miss HANNAH MORE's ignorance is equal to her temerity. *The Stranger*, she informs us, is the first instance of an adulteress being held up in any other light than to be *reprobated*. Probably, this *manufacturer* of *sacred dramas* never read, or witnessed the representation of *Jane Shore*."

[14] A. S****k [Schink], *The Stranger: A Comedy* (London, 1798). The author's preface to this play angrily denounces Sheridan for having returned the script to him some one and a half years earlier with the answer "that they did not think it would succeed in representation," and accuses Sheridan of plagiary therefrom in his very successful play.

performances. When his modification of the plot was incorporated into the acting version of the play, as it occasionally was (frequently in Philadelphia), the result was unhappy because, as the London *Times* (6 February 1815) wrote in a review of such a performance, Mrs. Haller's "immoderate sorrow seems almost without a ground." More frequently the final reconciliation —the most controversial part of the play—was simply obscured. Sheridan, for example, had Kemble and Mrs. Siddons walk off the stage in opposite directions when critics were most vociferous in their protests, and again, twenty-five years later, "the conclusion is managed in the best possible manner," in the opinion of the *Theatrical Observer* (12 November 1824), "as it is doubtful whether the parties are reconciled or not." Helen Faucit's interpretation of Mrs. Haller included a new and successful device to accomplish the same end: "At the denouement, when her husband opens his arms to receive her, she sprung towards him, but on the sudden, struck with the remembrance of her guilt, she fell insensible to the earth."[15] *The Lady's Newspaper* (8 October 1853), attacking the play and its morality, reports that now "*Mrs. Haller* either faints or dies on the stage in the last act; and her husband may either bolt off with one or both the children, or remain in an attitude beside her prostrate form." In America similar devices were employed to placate those critics who thought the play "one of the most unnatural and revolting that keeps its place on the American stage."[16]

In spite of the plethora of printer's ink spent on the question of *The Stranger's* moral effect, a few writers did realize that this play was nothing more than sentimental *kitsch*, that in spite of its phenomenal career it was not the serious "problem play" for which so many critics mistook it. Leigh Hunt wrote: "Prejudices are fused in the tears of sympathy." Hazlitt thought that *The Stranger* and other Kotzebue plays were "a good thing . . . a fine hallucination . . . a noble madness"; audiences, he continued, "have their eyes wide open all the time, and almost cry them out before they come away, and therefore they go again."[17] The play, obviously, neither solves, nor even attempts to solve, the problem it *seems* to raise: should a man forgive and reinstate his adulterous wife? The resolution is accidental and emotional, a powerful *coup de théâtre* which utilizes almost every melodramatic device used in such scenes, including the representation of pleading children. Under the guise of serious artistic treatment of an ethical problem the play was thus further helped in retaining the limelight. Thackeray, in his amusing description, in *Pendennis* (chapter iv), of what was probably a typical provincial performance of *The Stranger*, attacks the play on many counts but himself concludes sentimentally: "In the midst of the balderdash, there runs that reality of love, children, and forgiveness of wrong, which will be listened to wherever it is preached, and sets all the world sympathizing."

The character of the Stranger helped to contribute to the sentimental appeal of the play. Morbidity and misanthropy were very fashionable in England in the last two decades of the eighteenth century, when *Werther* was by far the most popular of the translated works of Goethe. A recent study documents the misanthropic Stranger's correspondence

[15] *Theatrical Observer*, 9 February 1836.
[16] *Chicago Tribune*, 23 March 1864.
[17] "Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth," *Collected Works*, eds. A. R. Waller and Arnold Glover (London, 1902-1904), V, 360.

to the concept of a hero embodying the contemporary "nervous disorders among the intelligentsia of all classes."[18] In Act I the Stranger reads Zimmermann's *On Solitude*, which contains many of the principles of the *Werther* philosophy. This book was translated into English in 1791 and was widely read in England and in America.[19] The male lead, however, diminished steadily in popularity as his prototype became outmoded. Early English Strangers like John Kemble and Charles Young were praised for their portrayals of dejection.[20] Hazlitt, in his tribute to the retiring Kemble, recalls his Stranger primarily as the portrayal of a "whole life [which] had been a suppressed sigh!"[21] James Boaden, Kemble's friend and biographer, recalls "with no parallel in any other performance" the actor's "look, his sigh, his tone" and similar manifestations of misery.[22]

Later attention was focused more and more on the female lead, and what praise male stars did receive they merited for opposite qualities. The *Times* (24 January 1849) praised Charles Kean, who had just performed the role before Queen Victoria at Windsor Castle, for "his heart [which], although crushed, still glows with Nature's kindliest elements," and *The Lady's Newspaper* (27 January 1849) found "the enraged husband . . . next to *Hamlet* . . . Mr. Kean's first effort." The *New York Herald* (4 September 1845), during the Keans' American tour some years earlier, had criticized the Stranger as being "but a walking misanthrope . . . an ineffective character." Although Edwin Booth performed the role frequently and successfully in the 1860's and the 1870's, the play was by then recognized as being principally a vehicle for actresses.

A play which had been able to hold the interest of audiences so long naturally attracted star performers. Kemble's Stranger was one of his most popular parts, and Mrs. Siddons' Mrs. Haller was, with the exception of her Elvira, the only original role which further enhanced her popularity; it was immortalized in Sir Thomas Lawrence's well-known portrait, and in less artistic ways.[23] The performances of these stars, two of the greatest English actors of all times, soon became legend and made later actors strive to give their own interpretation of the parts, much as they still strive to essay the part of Hamlet. Furthermore, the melodramatic parts were of the type which nineteenth-century actors relished. The *Morning Chronicle* eulogized the acting of the stars as highly as the other papers which reviewed the première; but it added: "[*The Stranger*] does not rely solely

[18] Robert L. Kahn, "Personality Factors in Kotzebue's Work," *PQ*, XXX (1951), 78.

[19] Theodor Suepfle, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur in England im Letzten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, Neue Folge, 6. Band (Berlin, 1893), pp. 305-328. In this country, however, the misanthropy does not appear to have had the appeal which it had had in England. Cumberland's *Wheel of Fortune* (1795), whose hero, Penruddock, anticipated, and also was thought to have been modelled on, the Stranger, was not as popular here as it had been in England. When *The Stranger* became popular and charges of plagiary rose against both plays the *Commercial Advertiser* (20 December 1798) wrote, before a performance of *Wheel of Fortune:* "The public will be enabled to judge whether the charge of plagiarism is just, and if so, which is entitled to preference, the copy or the original." On the 24th a brief note in the same newspaper states: "The 'Wheel of Fortune' will probably be henceforth consigned to the shelf."

[20] In America, on the other hand, "Crito" in the *Commercial Advertiser* (17 January 1800) expressed a marked preference for Hodgkinson's Stranger. Cooper, in Crito's opinion, concentrated too much on portraying a misanthrope while "Hodgkinson gives us the man who would be so if he could."

[21] *Times* (25 June 1817), reprinted in *Collected Works*, VIII, 376.

[22] *Memoirs of the Life of John Philip Kemble, Esq.* (Philadelphia, 1825), pp. 379-380.

[23] Cf. "Lines written on seeing Mrs. Siddons, as Mrs. Haller, in 'The Stranger'," *The Lady's Magazine*, August 1798.

upon the merit of the performer. It calls forth his powers, but at the same time it furnishes him with a weapon which, wielded with skill, cannot fail to reach the heart." Little wonder, then, that most famous nineteenth-century stars essayed the main roles in this play, thereby perpetuating and increasing its popularity and their own.

At last, however, some of the qualities which had made *The Stranger* so affecting for so long a period began to pall.[24] Perhaps the *Spirit of the Times* (28 April 1866) best summarizes the feelings of audiences who were to turn from the play almost thirty years later:

> No scenes—no events—no situations. A runaway wife, a namby-pamby family harboring her, comprising a fool of a husband, another fool of a wife, a soft-headed wife's brother, an ass of a butler or porter, a donkey of a servant; a strange black-dressed vagabond lurking around, with an equally strange and unspeakable servant. It is a perfect nightmare of a play. . . . There are two figures who do all the work—two big, blubbering boobies; the Stranger, with his settled "lemoncholy," and the Strangeress with her spasmodic Remorse. . . . It is a good play to sober-off upon. After a three-days' drunk, give me soda plain, and "The Stranger"—that would make Bacchus sign the teetotal pledge.

But it was not the sentimentality here ridiculed which was dated. The sentimentality of *The Stranger* does not differ essentially from that of *Camille* or *East Lynne*, the plays which most directly inherited its popularity, and the first of which is performed to this day. The principal attributes which dated the play, as the later reviews as well as the burlesques of the play testify,[25] were the language and the Stranger's *Weltschmerz*.

The first review of the play in the *Morning Chronicle* called the language "pathetic and elegant, in many parts highly poetical, . . . a strong contrast to the . . . tame verbosity of our own modern Dramatists." The London *Times* (29 January 1891), in its last review of the play, called the speeches "dreary, lachrymose," and found the only saving grace of the play to lie in "the savour of burlesque which attaches to some of its more dismal lines and situations." Perhaps the most graphic illustration of the anachronistic mood of the Stranger was a pithy verse which was popular at the time Reece's revealingly entitled burlesque, *The Stranger: Stranger Than Ever!*, played in London:

> Each evening you may see him sitting so
> Under that Linden when the sun was low.
> On close inspection too you'll also see
> His noble eye sir! rolling rapidly.[26]

The theme which had kept *The Stranger* on the stage for so long, however, has never become dated. Utilized by Aeschylus, it is one of the oldest and most popular themes of drama. *The Chicago Tribune* (26 December 1874), reviewing Booth's performance of the title role, incidentally hints at this fact in its naive attack on "fallen women" plays:

[24] The last important performances of the play were those of Wilson Barrett in London in 1891 and in his American tour in various cities, including Chicago and Boston, in 1894. The play was probably performed in the provinces beyond these years. John Drew recalls seeing it in London in "a small theatre with alluring bills" under the title *Walberg, the Avenger*, and in that form it may have held the London stage even in the twentieth century. See Drew's *My Years on the Stage* (New York, 1922), pp. 58-59.

[25] Among travesties of the play—further testimony to the play's great popularity—are: *The Rovers: or, the Double Arrangement*, a satire of German drama in general and *Stella, Kabale und Liebe, Die Räuber* as well as *Menschenhass und Reue* in particular, printed in the 28 May and 11 June 1798 issues of the *Anti-Jacobin;* Robert Reece, *The Stranger: Stranger Than Ever!* a "Piece of Extravagance in One Act," performed successfully in London in 1868 and 1870, and published in London by Lacy (n.d.); and A. J. Leavitt, *The Stranger*, A Burlesque Negro Sketch in one Scene, arranged by Charles White, which had a popular run in New York and Philadelphia during the years 1859-1875.

[26] Quoted by L. F. Thompson, *Kotzebue* (Paris, 1928), p. 63.

[*The Stranger*] was the first of the series which gradually introduced the pernicious mock-sentimental period into the history of the drama, and marks an era. So did "Camille" mark an era, and the latter was the legitimate outgrowth of the former. It would have been as impossible to make "The Stranger" a sensation after "Camille" as to have made relishable that latter mess to the unprepared tastes and unaccustomed modes of thought which belonged to our parents and grandparents.

"Immorality" of this sort has always been attractive on the stage. The rigid moral code of the Victorians, with its taboo on the recognition and its consequent denial of the existence of sexual drives; the influence of new theories of evolution and psychology; the eventual collapse of Victorian mores and social norms; their reappearance as a modified puritanical code somehow reconciling Darwin, Freud, *and* Victoria—all these factors helped to make ethical aberrations of that type an even more fascinating topic for twentieth-century audiences. Mrs. Haller is the first in a line of famous modern women who have sinned for the edification of the public, and one of the few fictitious women who got away with it.[27] The intense preoccupation with the moral effect of plays, which was so common in the first part of the nineteenth century, helped Kemble and Mrs. Siddons give *The Stranger* its great initial popularity. The strong sentimental appeal of the play, its serious, "problem play" guise, the attraction of the many stars who appeared in it, and its excellent construction which adroitly placed these qualities in focus, all united in perpetuating the popularity of *The Stranger* for a whole century.

[27] Cf. note 9, above. It is interesting to note that in one of the popular versions of *Camille* the heroine awakes at the finale to find that she had been dreaming the story portrayed. In this version she was, of course, permitted to live at the end of the play.

* * *

# RHETORIC AND THE CAMPAIGN OF 1956

I.

THE presidential campaign of 1956 involved special factors which distinguish it sharply from its recent predecessors. All four major candidates had been principal contenders in the campaign four years earlier, the President's personal popularity was the outstanding fact recognized by both sides, and the avenues of public address, if not essentially different, were developed in use in such ways as almost to constitute them new media. The practice of reviewing a campaign is not new to the *QJS*, but the kind of symposia which *QJS* ran in 1948 and 1952 seemed not entirely appropriate or feasible for a back-look in February 1957. We offer to our readers, therefore, five independent essays which concentrate attention upon those characteristics which appear to distinguish the candidates and the campaign of 1956. These essays are intended to be read as supplements to those printed four years ago. They have been written with those essays as assumed background.

Harold F. Harding, who writes on President Eisenhower, is a former editor of *QJS*, who, in 1948, initiated the symposia on the presidential campaigns. He is Professor of Speech at Ohio State University, and has recently been appointed Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Robert Lasch analyzes Stevenson's speaking, not from the point of view of the academic critic but of the active journalist. Mr. Lasch is an editorial writer on *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and a regular contributor to *The Progressive*. He has also written for *The Reporter* and *The Atlantic Monthly* and has been a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford and a Nieman Fellow at Harvard. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* is especially pleased to welcome him to its pages.

Barnet Baskerville, Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Washington, contributes a sequel to his piece on Richard Nixon in the campaign symposium of 1952. Readers will recall also his penetrating discussion of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in *Today's Speech*, September, 1954. Professor Baskerville has just resumed his regular duties after a year at Harvard University on a Ford Foundation Fellowship.

Douglas Ehninger, essayist on Senator Kefauver, also contributed to the 1952 symposium with a commentary on the campaign in the South. He is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Florida and is editor of *The Southern Speech Journal*. He has served as editor of Book Reviews for the *QJS* and is a member of the new editorial board.

Ernest J. Wrage, whose treatment of the dominant rhetorical characteristics of the campaign as a whole concludes the series, is Professor of Public Speaking at Northwestern University. Mr. Wrage is well-known for his distinguished course in contemporary public address. He is the editor of a symposium in rhetorical criticism which will appear in *Western Speech*.

The essayists on the campaign, it will be evident, proceeded independently. The editor made no effort to foment or to forestall conflict of opinion, to insure against overlapping of subject matter, or to prescribe modes of treatment. He exerted only the pressures required by severe limitations of space and time. The contributors suffered—but submitted.

D. C. B.

## II.

## EISENHOWER, THE CANDIDATE

By H. F. Harding

The title of this brief appraisal is misleading. It was almost impossible in the Fall of 1956 for the ordinary American voter to think of Ike as a candidate. He was always the President, and the formality of making him a candidate at San Francisco in August was boring from the start.

It is difficult in short space to say much about the 1956 Presidential Campaign that hasn't been said before. It is more difficult to be profound or philosophical. I think, therefore, that I shall raise a number of questions for readers to answer in their own way. In spite of the recent advances in poll-taking techniques, there is no sure way of telling why the individual voter votes as he does. In giving my short answers I simply make it easy for my friends to disagree.

### A Dozen Questions and One Man's Answers:

1. *Who won the 1956 Presidential Campaign?*

The man who was expected to win by the Republicans and the same man whom Mr. Nixon had said they couldn't win without. The vote was even more overwhelming than in 1952. Eisenhower ran ahead of his party (9 per cent more than the Republicans running for the House of Representatives), and Stevenson trailed his party (by about 3 per cent less than the Democrats running for Congress).

2. *Do you attribute Eisenhower's success and Stevenson's failure to the kinds of speeches they made?*

No. I think the results would probably have been about the same if each speaker had made few speeches or none at all. The catastrophic events in Poland, Hungary, and the Middle East in October, 1956, made most Americans react, I believe, as they did in the war years, 1940 and 1944, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was a candidate for re-election. But even so, I am one of those strange persons who believe that the mass of voters make up their minds in June, or even earlier, and no amount of speechmaking, persuasive or otherwise, has much changing effect.

3. *What about the Independent or Undecided Voter?*

Ah yes! He's supposed to make up 5 per cent to 20 per cent or more of the electorate. And if you include those reaching the age of twenty-one, this constitutes a large prize group. In 1952 I think Stevenson captured the interest of many Independents from the start. In 1956 I believe the Independents voted for Democratic governors and senators and congressmen. But in the case of the 1956 Presidential candidates the Undecideds seem to have decided on Ike.

4. *Do you think it was a lively campaign that really captured the attention of American voters?*

No. It was dull in comparison with the speeches of the 1952 campaign. And Europeans thought so, too. Max Ascoli wrote in an editorial for *The Reporter* (October 4, 1956): "Four years ago our Presidential Campaign aroused passionate concern all over the world. Not just a new American Chief Executive was being elected, but the leader of a world wide community of men united by a hope and a faith. This time the traveler has the feeling that in foreign eyes it is as if we were having a country wide contest for Sheriff."

5. *Were American audiences sufficiently critical of the speakers and their speeches?*

Certainly not in a way to please members of the *Speech Association of America*. I attribute this lack to the fact that the 1956 speeches were less carefully listened to. The Republican Convention itself was "dull theatre" in contrast with the struggle the Democrats staged in Chicago. The number of trained speech critics in the United States is minuscule. The number of die-hard, party-loyal voters runs into millions. But in every community there are a few souls (probably never more than 5 per cent) who earnestly listen to what a candidate says and really study his qualifications and his record. This year those persons said: "I'm afraid Stevenson hasn't a ghost of a chance," and they went on with their reading.

6. *How did the speeches of the two candidates compare with those of 1952?*

I think Eisenhower's were better and Stevenson's not so good. For one thing Ike seemed to have mastered the techniques of TV speaking (thanks to Robert Montgomery) while Stevenson seemed ill at ease. I thought Stevenson's speeches of 1956 were less substantial, less witty, and at times less sincere. On the other hand, the responsibility of being President made Eisenhower appear better informed, more concerned with the best interests of all the people, and therefore more of a statesman and less of a politician. This, of course, was the same impression Richard Nixon tried hard to create. Whereas Stevenson's 1952 speeches in published form attained best-seller recognition, I doubt whether the 1956 versions will appear in print. It is a pity Stevenson could not have retained the attractive features of his 1952 personality.

7. *Did Eisenhower and Stevenson actually write their speeches in 1956?*

It all depends on what you mean by *write*. Both men had the help of research assistants, writers of drafts and redrafts, editors, and consultants on mass psychology. In 1952 Eisenhower had the benefit of such persons as Dr. Stanley High of *Reader's Digest* (an old FDR assistant), Mr. Emmett J. Hughes of *Life*, Mr. Kevin McCann, the president of Defiance College, and the Special Assistant at SHAPE and at Columbia. In 1956 the chief new figure was Mr. Arthur Larson, former Dean of the Law School at the University of Pittsburgh, Undersecretary of Labor, and author of the book, *A Republican Looks at His Party*. The full story of just how much President Eisenhower contributed to the speech-writing process in August, September, and October, 1956, remains to be told.

Stevenson again made use of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the Harvard historian. But neither speaker has ever had on his staff the equal of such persons as Robert Sherwood, Archibald MacLeish, Raymond Moley, Samuel I. Rosenman, or FDR himself.

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson delivered all his campaign speeches—with the single exception of the Speech of Acceptance—extemporaneously, that is, by use of a single sheet of notes rather than a carefully written set of paragraphs. No candidate in recent history has equalled this skill. Witness the vast difference between the style of Eisenhower on TV and Eisenhower at a White House Press Conference. Witness too the considerable stylistic differences between Stevenson of 1952 and Stevenson of 1956. And don't neglect the Stevenson of the LP record made from tape recordings by Arnold Michaelis at Libertyville, Illinois, in June 1956. This record, let

us hope, reveals the true Stevenson rather than the blundering TV address of the campaign opening at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

8. *What about the frequency of the campaign speeches in 1956?*

Eisenhower early announced that he would speak less often than in 1952. But as the tempo of the campaign increased, he added speeches to his schedule. Both candidates relied extensively on TV and radio coverage. There was little or no rear-platform speaking. Only Senator Kefauver indulged in the old-fashioned folksy approach on the small-town circuit. Stevenson probably spoke four or five times as often as Eisenhower. Nixon spoke almost as much as Stevenson. Because of the increased use of television fewer speeches were adapted to the immediate audiences and fewer speeches dealt with a single subject. Every TV appearance, it seems, contained a little pap for voters of all ages and all stages of mental development—up to a certain point. Had the American voter been less indifferent he would have deserved better intellectual fare than he received. Unfortunately, there are far too few persons in our country with seriously-held political opinions.

9. *What were the effects of the 1956 speeches?*

I will be pleased to meet anybody who knows the answer to this question. True, Eisenhower won. But so did a lot of Democrats. I often doubt whether speechmaking really is connected with getting elected. A Democratic governor from a border state who had a pretty wife with a white hat—for the life of me I can't recall his name—made a speech at the 1956 Democratic Convention that some critics ("trained observers" or "veteran commentators") said was powerfully persuasive. I was more influenced by the words of Eleanor Roosevelt speaking from the same platform.

It seems safe to say that Eisenhower didn't lose many voters by his speeches. But I think Stevenson did lose votes by some of his remarks in the hectic last ten days of his campaign.

Did either Eisenhower or Stevenson win-over large numbers of voters who couldn't make up their minds by, let us say, November 1, 1956? This is a problem I prefer to turn over to a team of graduate students. I suspect that as often as not a voter makes up his mind about a candidate by some factor other than his public addresses.

10. *Were there any memorable speeches in the campaign?*

None that are comparable with FDR's Madison Square Garden addresses or his address to the Teamsters, the Fala speech, or his first Acceptance address in 1932. Perhaps the very deluge of campaign addresses makes them less worth remembering—if not less worth taking seriously. Mass advertising produces mental saturation. Speech-making to the masses seems to produce and thrive on mental sogginess. Nevertheless, both Stevenson's and Eisenhower's Acceptance speeches struck me as being better than others. I liked Stevenson's attempts to discuss the H-bomb testing and the lessening need for the draft. But, by and large, I thought both speakers were weak in their ability to organize ideas. Stevenson's invention and his style were often attractive. Eisenhower's delivery was far better than in 1952. Mamie Eisenhower undeniably won friends for her husband. Stevenson was doubtless handicapped by his divorce. Both candidates possess so little hair it scarcely made a difference.

11. *How do you account for Eisenhower's victory?*

He had a favorable horoscope, knew the right people, belonged to some good clubs, and had the reputation of paying his bills promptly. Mr. Robert J. Donovan's book, *Eisenhower: The Inside Story*, gives no better clues. We do not find here, for example, a portrait of a well-read man, an original or imaginative thinker of philosophic attributes, or a man with a program come hell or high water. If Eisenhower has a program—other than trying to maintain peace by brinkmanship—it is not clearly defined after innumerable interviews, statements, and addresses.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is the reflector of public opinion rather than the manipulator. He acts like a middle-of-the-roader to most persons. But he's really better than his party and more liberal than most of its leaders. It's easier to put trust in him than in some of the members of his Cabinet, for instance. Ike comes at an opportune time in history and, as one writer has said, "the unity and the very existence of the Republican Party are still entirely dependent on Eisenhower."

For rhetorical students Eisenhower is the phenomenon of the age—the supreme example of the power of ethical appeal. He is adept at making his own character attractive and in putting his hearers, be they American voters or Russian leaders, into a proper frame of mind.

12. *What then is the basis of Eisenhower's enormous personal appeal?*

Here we must be serious. The man is honest, sincere, hard-working (in spite of all the golf-playing and trips to the country), and genuinely dedicated to the Cause of Peace. He appears as a Father Image to millions of American mothers and young persons. His heart attack and his operation for ileitis revealed a worship in the American people unequaled since the day Franklin D. Roosevelt died in April, 1945.

One of Eisenhower's instructors at the Command and General Staff College has told me about his keen ability at solving tactical problems and about his winning ways as an Army captain. He early displayed his skill in getting men to work together and in getting the best possible performance out of a group. Read *Crusade in Europe* and General Omar Bradley's *A Soldier's Story* for the details of how this art, this superb leadership, met the test in North Africa and in Europe.

President Truman did not recall General Eisenhower to become the Supreme Commander, Allied Powers Europe, for reasons other than his faith in the ability of the man.

Aristotle says, "There are three things which inspire confidence in the orator's own character—the three, namely, that induce us to believe a thing apart from any proof of it: good sense, good moral character, and good will." It is amply evident that President Eisenhower has convinced the American people he has these attributes.

## Conclusion

James Reston, the Washington correspondent of the *New York Times*, said in the concluding article of his series, "Eisenhower's Four Years" (August 3, 1956, p. 7), that General Eisenhower has by his wise leadership "appealed to the best in the American character. . . . It is primarily the remarkable personal gifts and popularity of this one appealing but wounded soldier [in politics] that are giving direction to the Republican Party."

The Princeton historian, Eric F. Gold-

man, has written a remarkable appraisal, "The Eisenhower Equilibrium," in the concluding pages of *The Crucial Decade: America, 1945-1955* (1956). These sentences (p. 289) more than any others I've read explain why Eisenhower was re-elected: "Somehow, amid all the bitter disagreements of the post-World War II period, the United States felt its way to a genuinely national mood. It was not the kind of arrival that could be announced in ringing tones. It contained, in fact, a determination not to be too sure where you were or where you ought to go. It was nothing more or less than the decision on the part of a people who were so in-between in so many of their attitudes to go cautiously, patiently, good humoredly maintaining equilibrium."

To keep this equilibrium the voter seems to have given his approval last November 6th to the man first, his policies second, and his party third.

III.

## STEVENSON

By Robert Lasch

Two kinds of people, according to my experience, worried most about the supposedly lower level of Adlai Stevenson's campaign speeches in 1956 as compared with those of 1952. First there were the people who had shown no appreciation whatever of the 1952 speeches at the time they were given, but now suddenly discovered, retrospectively, that Stevenson was not the man he had been. By and large, these affiants were the same persons who in 1952 had gravely condemned Stevenson for talking over the heads of the people. Now they found him too much on the low road, a recreant to the fine ideals and pure eloquence that had not impressed them in his first campaign. Secondly, there were the political dilettantes, who had been girlishly titillated by Stevenson's words in 1952 but four years later, jaded and spent, just could not recapture the old thrill. He did not send them any more.

I suspect that the two groups had something in common. Both recognized that Stevenson in 1956 was a political veteran rather than a novice, much surer of himself, much less awed by the now distinctly tarnished image of his hero opponent, more frankly and knowledgeably partisan. He had walked through fire, by this time. He was no longer the reluctant candidate, plucked from a gubernatorial campaign to carry the burdens of Trumanism half unwillingly in a campaign for which he knew himself not yet ready. For the 1956 nomination he had fought hard. From the despond of Minnesota, when for a few days he seemed to be finished, he had climbed back through New Jersey and Pennsylvania, Oregon and Florida, to the smashing primary triumph of California. He had vanquished Kefauver, surmounted the petty ego of Harriman and the ghoulish hopes of all the dark horses, firmly put down the Truman revolt, subdued the Dixiecrats without yielding to them, and emerged as a powerful party leader, free possessor of a nomination won by as few deals and compromises as any in history. So, in September, when nobody could be sure that Eisenhower was invincible, Stevenson was a man to be afraid of. People who were irrevocably committed to Eisenhower (if only because they could not afford to admit having been wrong in 1952) expressed their anxiety by a nit-picking approach to Stevenson which revealed to them

flaws in a character they had been unwilling to admire four years earlier.

My own conviction is that this attitude reflected subjective rationalizations rather than any actual change in Stevenson's campaigning or a loss of moral stature. There were, of course, speeches in this campaign that did not reach the heights. The boresome ritual of identifying himself with every two-bit local candidate while his national audience waited impatiently for the fireworks to begin overloaded Stevenson's take-offs and usually left him with insufficient time to finish his speech on the air. Yet this is such a sacred ritual that Eisenhower also followed it, the main difference being that the President read off the names of his indispensable associates with the mechanical air of seeing them for the first time. Stevenson looked rather silly in some of the homely five-minute films concocted by the Democratic gentlemen of Madison Avenue who thought the way to stage a show was just the way Robert Montgomery does it. There were times, as in the Harrisburg speech formally opening the campaign, when Stevenson's troubles with the teleprompter flattened his oratory, and other times when he appeared dreadfully tired or simply, as any intelligent man would be, sick of the sound of his own voice. But I would insist that if you took all the speeches of both campaigns, and weighed them coolly in a mood of historical objectivity, you would find those of 1956 generally up to the level of 1952 and in some cases beyond it. Would you say the following is high-level or low-level?

> The price support program is doing a good job for the basic crops—corn, cotton, wheat, rice and the others—for which loan and storage operations are now in effect. The same protection could be accorded to other storable commodities. For perishable products, however, such as hogs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables, these loan and storage operations do not work well. Yet these products provide about three-fourths of all the income received by farmers. Our first line of defense for the producers of perishables is, of course, a strong economic policy that will insure, so far as it is humanly possible to do so, high employment and purchasing power. But behind this there should be protection against unreasonably low prices for those producers of perishables who need it. They should know they can expand production and that the public that benefits will bear part.

Now let us compare that passage with another:

> Unless the American people are given the information required to understand the needs of this tempestuous, turbulent period when the swirling waters of three revolutions are converging, they will listen to demagogues who promise quick and easy solutions. But the ideological revolution of Communism cannot be met by quick and easy solutions. Neither can the political revolution of the oppressed and the newly independent peoples, or the historic revolution of technology throughout the world. I ask your support not because I say that all is well, but because I say that we must work hard, with tireless dedication, to make the small gains out of which, we may hope, large gains will ultimately be fashioned. I ask your support not in the name of complacency but in the name of anxiety. . . . I am in politics as a result of a personal decision to do what I could to help in building a peaceful world. That decision carried with it an obligation—the obligation to talk sense, to tell the truth as I see it, to discuss the realities of our situation, never to minimize the tasks that lie ahead. I don't know whether that is the way to win in politics, but it is the only way I want to win.

The first passage is a fairly good sample of the sort of group appeal which some of my friends deplored when they shed crocodile tears over the low-level Stevenson, and the second is certainly the type of elevated approach that thrilled the dilettantes in 1952. Yet the "demagogic" bid for the farm vote, skirting the "immoral" Brannan plan, was made at Kasson, Minn., September 6, 1952, and the high-minded appeal to

reason was made at Cincinnati, October 19, 1956.

Many other examples could be cited. They all add up to the proposition that Adlai Stevenson was both a high-minded man and a politician in 1952, and that in 1956 he was the same high-minded man but a better politician. And a lot of Eisenhower voters were afraid of him.

Stevenson was the victim of a curious willingness of many voters to apply a double standard in this campaign. He came in for a good deal of criticism for being a member of the same party as Eastland, Talmadge, and Long. It was hinted that he had sold his soul on civil rights for a mess of electoral votes from the South. Eisenhower, on the other hand, got credit for being a brave exponent of equality, who had abolished segregation at one stroke in Washington, in the armed services, and in government contracts, and who would not be circumscribed by the Southern Democrats in Congress. As things turned out it was Stevenson, and not Eisenhower, who stood up in Little Rock to say that the Supreme Court school decision was a law that ought to be carried out. It was Eisenhower, and not Stevenson, who tripped lightly around the racial question in Florida and saved his courage for New York. Yet I did not notice that Stevenson received any widespread plaudits for his candor. On the contrary it was one of the marvels of this campaign that Eisenhower, pussyfooting on civil rights in the South, not only gained more Southern white votes than he had won in 1952, but likewise commanded significant strength from such of the Southern Negroes as were permitted to vote—enough, the experts say, to give him Louisiana and Tennessee. At one and the same time he was, of course, breaking into the recently solid Democratic ranks of Negro districts in New York and Chicago. It was a wonder of statesmanship as performed by Eisenhower and would have been a masterpiece of duplicity had it been performed by Stevenson.

Without being bitter about it, one must say that this was, in an exceptional way, a campaign that proved the need for amending the doctrine of democratic faith by which we tell ourselves that the people when informed make generally sound decisions. There are times, and this was one of them, when the people just decline to be informed. By design and inclination, the Republicans refused to enter the debate. They staked everything on the feelings evoked by Ike's personality. To ideas presented by Stevenson they replied, not with better ideas, but with the appeal *ad hominem*. They disposed of issues by blandly declaring that there were no issues. And 35,000,000 Americans, suffused with the warm emotions aroused by the carefully drawn portrait of a family man, a man of God, a heroic man, a safe, strong, and competent man, agreed.

The result was a block to communication which prevented Stevenson from getting across to people's minds. It is fashionable to say that he cannot project himself to large audiences. But nobody can establish communication when one end of the line is cut off. In proposing an American initiative for an agreement to end H-bomb tests, and in just barely suggesting that there might be a better way to build a peacetime army than the wasteful and inefficient draft, Stevenson presented two ideas that deserved attention, whether the country agreed with him or not. I have a strong feeling that most Americans got their conception of what Stevenson was proposing not from him but from his opponents' version of it. (Certainly Eisenhower must have done so, for he never once listened to "that fellow.")

In one Eisenhower newspaper, I saw the top play on Page One given to a Nixon speech in which he was "explaining" Stevenson's H-bomb proposal. In the same edition, subordinate treatment was given to a Stevenson speech in which he explained it for himself. A great many people, I suspect, paid more attention, just as this news editor did, to the Nixon version than to the original.

And so Stevenson's agreed ban on H-bomb testing became a naive and half-subversive plan to give up the H-bomb. His proposal to start working toward a long-enlistment, skilled, professional armed force became a half-baked appeal for national weakness. If history confirms what there is good reason to believe, that the Eisenhower Administration at one stage considered proposing both a ban on H-bomb tests and some modification of the draft, but abandoned both when Stevenson seized the initiative, we shall have further evidence that in 1956 Eisenhower could have won without ever opening his mouth.

If people's minds were closed at the beginning of the campaign, they became more firmly sealed during the last ten days. This was the time when Stevenson did what he should have done earlier—hit hard at Eisenhower's part-time performance in the White House (before as well as after the two illnesses), and exposed the follies, vacillations, and irrelevance of the Dulles-Eisenhower foreign policy. It was also the time when that foreign policy was blowing up in all our faces. The Middle East was in flames and nobody could be sure that the great world war was not being born there. "I have good news from Suez," the President had just said. Here was vivid proof that sweeping crises under the rug does not dispose of them, not even until after election. Here was a painfully dramatic demonstration of deep fissures in the Atlantic alliance, of appalling Soviet penetration of the Mediterranean, of irresolution and retreat in the face of the kind of threat which Truman and Acheson had stood up to. Yet there seems to be no doubt that the days of crisis accelerated the sweep to Eisenhower. They confirmed people's predisposition not to think about anything. From liking Ike because he had averted world crises the people shifted gears without a pause to liking Ike because the crisis was upon us. In this mood it was easy for them to regard as bad taste any reference to the fact that the President was a poor insurance risk, and yet not to question the good taste of such a poor risk running for another term.

What will be the long-run consequences of this campaign? It was such a complete triumph of personality over rationality, of show business over debate, of feelings over ideas, that the temptation will be overpowering for candidates of both parties henceforth to entrust their destinies to Madison Avenue. Eisenhower was packaged and sold like a new detergent. When the strategists of mass consumption can plot a sales campaign which succeeds so enormously in spite of a heart attack, a major operation, a Middle East war, and a basic Democratic trend in local and congressional elections, who can blame any future candidate for wanting to use the same techniques?

If they are wise, however, future candidates will remind themselves that the techniques have succeeded only in the case of a particular kind of product being sold in a particular kind of market. Eisenhower admittedly is a most extraordinary package for the merchandisers to work with, and the circumstances of these years will not be precisely repeated. The pitchmen will

have their day, but then it will be discovered that not just any product can be sold by their methods, and that politics still involves something in the way of ideas and policy. At least I like to think so.

IV.

## THE NEW NIXON

By Barnet Baskerville

One of Richard Nixon's primary tasks in the 1956 campaign was to project a new image of himself before the electorate. In a society in which new models are a commonplace and it is customary to speak of the "new look" in everything from automobiles to women's apparel, it was inevitable that this transformation of a candidate should have been acknowledged in the phrase "The New Nixon." There were those who maintained that the New Nixon was the true Nixon, and that the Old Nixon had been a vicious figment of "Democrat" imagination; but wherever the truth of this matter lay, it was clear that the old image had to be erased. The picture of Nixon the party hatchet man, the unprincipled demagogue, the "cardboard man" with two sides and no depth, was too firmly established to be ignored. Whether created by the man himself by irresponsible campaigning tactics from 1946 to 1954, or compounded by his enemies of smear articles in the liberal press and a backstreet campaign of gutter epithets—it was there; it existed.

The beginnings of a sustained attempt to change Nixon from villain to hero were seen at San Francisco. Mr. Stassen's efforts to replace him on the ticket having come to nothing, the delegates closed ranks around Eisenhower and Nixon in what was from the first more of a mass testimonial than a nominating convention. As Richard Rovere wrote from San Francisco, "It was Eisenhower's past that was being honored and Nixon's future that was being assured."

As the campaign got under way, reports of a new tone to Nixon's utterances began to appear in the press. In mid-October James Reston noted that the Vice-President was disappointing his critics by refusing to act the villain and by "conducting himself as the noble and romantic substitute for the leading man." William Blair, *New York Times* correspondent travelling with the Nixon party, wrote that the candidate seemed to be trying desperately to prove that he was no demagogue.[1] The difference in tone between his campaign utterances of 1954 and 1956 is implicit in the slogans of the two campaigns: "K-1, C-3" (Korea, Communism-Corruption-Controls); and "Peace, Prosperity, and Progress." There was little in the 1956 speeches to warrant charges of "hatchet man,"[2] or to suggest that he was the sinister character whom Herblock, in a cruel 1954 cartoon, had depicted emerging from a sewer to deliver a campaign speech. Instead of implying that his opponents and their associates were Communists, crooks, or fellow-travellers, the New Nixon portrayed Stevenson (to whom he had referred in the preceding campaign as "Adlai the Appeaser. . .who got a Ph.D. from Dean Acheson's Col-

[1] Some strategists urged Nixon to return to the more aggressive tactics of previous campaigns. Murray Chotiner, his former campaign manager, felt that the 1954 elections had been lost because "too many people in the administration wanted to act like statesmen." He warned that "If they don't start acting like politicians as well they won't have the opportunity of being statesmen."

[2] This role was taken over in 1956 by Thomas E. Dewey. See, for example, his speech at Pasadena, California, October 23, 1956.

lege of Cowardly Communist Containment") as a weak, bumbling, rather ridiculous amateur—"a second string quarterback who just isn't in the same league with President Eisenhower."

Moreover, although it had been persistently charged that the old Nixon had been a master of innuendo, an artist at planting an idea without actually saying what he appeared to say, there was much less of this sort of thing in the recent campaign. The device of linkage, used with devastating effect against former opponents such as Jerry Voorhis and Helen Douglas, was employed only infrequently, as when he warned of "Stevenson - Truman - ADA - Left Wing policies." And although he continued to display his old predilection for overpowering superlatives, they were usually less damning in their implications. Whereas in 1954 he had referred to a relatively mild Stevenson criticism of presidential policies as "one of the most vicious, scurrilous attacks ever made by a major political figure on a President of the United States," in 1956 he called a similar criticism "one of the most extraordinary, appalling statements in the history of American political campaigning."

There could be little doubt that this metamorphosis was calculated campaign strategy: one Nixon aide explained, "We had to show the country that he didn't have horns." President Eisenhower, Governor Dewey, and numerous local chairmen repeatedly bolstered the Nixon ethos, stoutly defending the Vice-President against "smear attacks." Nixon's Hershey speech near the end of the campaign was preceded by the reading of a telegram bestowing upon him the blessings of the White House, and he was introduced by Senator Duff as "a devoted friend of the President."

The decision to take a higher road than that hitherto travelled proved wise. Not only did Nixon disarm his critics, but he made their criticism seem unwarranted and malicious to those who—having been prepared for a villainous "smear artist"—found instead a smiling, attractive young man who seemed manfully to be maintaining his patience and dignity despite all efforts to destroy him. To such people the tables must have appeared to have been completely turned when in October Republican National Chairman Leonard Hall furiously denounced Governor Leader, Adlai Stevenson, and the members of their "Hatchet Squad," asserting that they were hurting only themselves "by indulging in slander and smear while they falsely charge Mr. Nixon with what they are doing themselves."

This restoration of Richard Nixon was, of course, not essentially an end in itself, but a means to the greater end of establishing him as an asset, rather than a liability, to the Republican cause. That he proved a distinct asset as a campaigner seems now almost universally agreed. Forced by the state of the President's health to bear the principal burden of campaigning, the Vice-President made three extensive tours, traveling approximately 34,000 miles, making 119 formal speeches and 200 informal talks in 36 states. Speaking extemporaneously, Nixon adhered to a basic formula carefully worked out before he left Washington, departing from what reporters soon came to call "The Speech" only to make appropriate local references and to comment upon his opponent's speeches or other developments in the campaign. To compensate for the sameness of his platform offerings and to provide fresh headlines each day, he devised the technique of pre-speech press conferences held at each new stop. This assured him of considerably more press attention than a vice-presidential candidate has usually received.

Nixon's basic speech was essentially an elaboration of the slogan, "Peace, Prosperity, and Progress." Eisenhower prosperity had resulted in "the best four years of our lives"; inflation had been halted, sound Eisenhower dollars had replaced rubber Truman dollars. Progress was seen in a "bold, dynamic new program" which had restored integrity and decency to government, engineered "history's greatest" tax cut, launched a highway development program. On the peace theme, Nixon was forced to extemporize variations to meet changing conditions abroad. Here he demonstrated one of his most notable skills—his amazing adaptability, his flair for turning almost anything to political advantage.

During September and October he emphasized the peace issue with mounting zeal: President Eisenhower had ended one war and avoided others, establishing himself as a symbol of peace and freedom in the world. On September 24, Nixon spoke enthusiastically of "the fact of peace-in-being—and the bright promise of continuing peace in the future." On October 13, he predicted confidently that the President's "tolerance and wisdom and leadership will serve to avert armed conflict" in the Middle East. When Mr. Stevenson objected that the situation was far from tranquil, that it was an uneasy peace at best, the Vice-President countered testily that it was not strange that those who had not recognized war in Korea could not recognize peace when it existed. On October 25, he observed that Stevenson had begun by saying that there was no peace, but had failed to "get away with this bald denial of the truth. Then . . . he finally discovered that the United States was not at war, but he said we have a 'press-agent's peace.' " Nixon expressed confidence that wives and mothers of American boys killed in Korea would choose the leadership of a man "who recognizes peace when we have it."

Four days later, war broke out in the Middle East. Finding his opponent's claims vindicated by this turn of events, Nixon never faltered. Having for seven weeks exhorted his audiences to support Mr. Eisenhower because of his conspicuous success in averting war, he now asserted that the existence of war made the President's re-election even more imperative. Calling Eisenhower "the greatest commander-in-chief America has ever had in war or peace," he warned against replacing him with a jittery novice. Leaping at once to the attack, he fell upon Mr. Stevenson with such fury as to suggest that that hapless man had himself, by calling attention to the fragility of the peace, actually brought about its disintegration. He accused the Democratic candidate of weakness and confusion; he denounced his H-bomb proposal as "the height of irresponsibility and absurdity"; he deplored his "crude attempt to inject politics into the crisis." Finally, he sought to shift the burden of proof by challenging his opponent to answer two questions: (1) What would he have done to prevent Israel's moving into Egypt? and (2) What would he do now? Nixon added that he did not expect an answer to these questions, since Stevenson was "an indecisive 'how not to do it man'—a pathetic Hamlet to the American political stage."

As a matter of fact, Mr. Stevenson had already answered the first of these questions—once as far back as November, 1955, when in Charlottesville, Virginia, he had advocated United Nations patrols of areas of violence, and again in more detail at Cincinnati, October 19, 1956. He addressed himself to the subject again on November 1 at Buffalo; and the following night at Detroit, he responded to Nixon's second question. Nevertheless,

the Vice-President continued to represent Stevenson as "a man of many words and little action" (a curious charge, since he had scarcely been in a position to take any action).

This is the fifth major campaign for Nixon in his ten years of public life. It is as a political speaker that he is known to his fellow Americans; hence it is likely that the key to his attractiveness for some, as well as the almost instinctive, unreasoning dislike he arouses in others, is to be found in his rhetoric.

Nixon is regarded by many as the best political speaker in America today. His voice is good, his manner dynamic and ingratiating, his contact with and adaptation to his audience excellent. He has mastered the skills of the platform to an unusual degree of perfection. He has remarkable verbal facility; he handles questions adroitly and confidently. There is, moreover, a disarming simplicity about what he says which makes many listeners wonder how anyone could doubt or mistrust this forthright young man. But closer observation reveals that his forthrightness is too frequently more apparent than real. Four years ago in this journal, in my analysis of Nixon's famous "Checkers" speech defending himself against charges of improper influence, I noted that the speech was a study in *appearances* as opposed to *realities*. Subsequent study of Mr. Nixon's speaking, and a close reading of several score of his 1956 campaign utterances, strengthen this conviction and compel the judgment that this preoccupation with appearances, this concern for the attractiveness of the package rather than the quality of the contents, is the outstanding characteristic of Nixon's political oratory. The touchstones of this rhetoric are not "Is it relevant?" or "Is it true?" but "Will people accept it as probably true? Will it win immediate applause?" In short, this is the rhetoric of plausibility.

The "Checkers" speech answered no charges, but obscured them in a mass of emotionally-loaded irrelevancies. A flood of warm congratulatory telegrams attested its plausibility. But only those who believe (in William Lee Miller's apt phrase) "that right and wrong are determined by Hooper ratings" could regard the speech as an exculpation. The repetition of the charge after the invasion of Egypt that Mr. Stevenson "can always tell you what you have done wrong, and what not to do, but he is never able to say decisively what ought to be done," was plausible to those who had not followed Stevenson's speeches. Plausible also was Nixon's assertion that while he had repeatedly submitted himself and his views "to the impartial and objective cross-examination of our nation's free press," his Democratic opponent was apparently afraid of being questioned. Yet representatives of the nation's free press cast doubt upon the genuineness of this eager desire to be cross-examined. According to Sam Armstrong of *The St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, "Anyone who has attended a Nixon press conference knows that there is no 'cross-examination'. . . . There is no debate and no opportunity to question the definite meaning of the generalities offered on a controversial subject." James Reston observes that "If the questions are tough, Nixon turns them around and answers some other question that is not asked." This is corroborated by William Blair, who adds that Nixon's press conferences "serve his purposes because he is adept at making them do just that." In the 1956 campaign, as in others that preceded it, Richard Nixon proved himself adept at making nearly everything serve his purposes, from Stevenson's kidney operation to Britain's advance on Suez.

But if this skill in making his own position attractive and plausible and that of his opponent ridiculous or sinister accounts for Nixon's popularity in some circles, how may we explain the "I don't know why, but I just don't like him" reaction reported by the probers of public opinion? One important cause of this antipathy may well be the man's fundamental immaturity—a characteristic which is accentuated by the eminence of his official position. A man's imagery often provides an insight into the furnishings of his mind; Nixon's imagery, and the manner of its delivery, often produce a total impression of incredible childishness. He described Stevenson's proposals on some occasions as "the Truman jalopy—which the people decided not to buy in 1952—with a new paint job," and on others as "the same old Truman hash warmed over a couple of times. No amount of catsup and trimmings will make it smell any better than it did in 1952." Such edifying metaphors as these are fired off in bursts of intense indignation. After each burst the speaker relaxes, beams in undisguised enjoyment of applause, and once again becomes intensely indignant.

This same boyish delight in the effects of his rhetorical thrusts is displayed in his "You're another!" responses to criticism. He replied to Stevenson's charge that Eisenhower foreign policy was "an abysmal and catastrophic failure," with "I have no quarrel with his adjectives, but he should have applied them to his own performance rather than the President's."[3] Apropos the question of Mr. Eisenhower's health, Nixon called attention to the President's robust appearance, then added, "Incidentally, I was just wondering how Mr. Stevenson's other kidney is doing today." When his opponent called him "a man of many masks," he countered roguishly with "Mr. Stevenson sees people running around with masks on their faces—and two days before Halloween." But for radiant, wide-eyed puerility, nothing quite matches Nixon's 1954 ebullition, "Isn't it wonderful that we finally have a Secretary of State who isn't taken in by the Communists, who stands up to them!"

Now it is readily acknowledged that the language of American politics is generally noted neither for the richness of its imagery nor the depth and maturity of its underlying thought. Such comments as we have just quoted are not unlike those heard throughout the land in an election year. But to hear them uttered, with a theatrical striving for effect, by the Vice-President of the United States, cannot but make the judicious grieve. One is reminded of the comment once made regarding a former President: "There was nothing in the man himself to arouse such a feeling [extreme dislike]: it was only the incongruity between himself and his pretensions."[4] As a salesman, an advertising man, or even a candidate for the state legislature, Richard Nixon might be unanimously accepted as a good fellow. But as official representative of a great nation, there is a disturbing incongruity between himself and his pretensions.

Since election day Nixon has been hailed as a highly successful political campaigner. Obviously, the extent to which the final vote reflects the effectiveness of campaign techniques is difficult, perhaps impossible, to determine. But it is certain that Nixon did not prove to be the serious liability which some

[3] What "performance" is meant here is uncertain; presumably Nixon referred to the speech in which Stevenson made the charge.

[4] Charles W. Thompson, *Presidents I've Known* (Indianapolis, 1929), p. 333. Said of Warren Harding, after he had delivered the Keynote Address at the 1916 Republican National Convention.

predicted he would be. Still, it is not generally regarded as a notable personal triumph for a candidate merely to have avoided *losing* votes for an immensely popular president. It has not, I think, been widely argued that Eisenhower himself either needed or received much help from his young running mate. His contribution, then, cannot be measured in increased votes for the President. Nor can it be said that he achieved his announced goal of winning a Republican Congress—although it might conceivably be maintained that, but for him, the Democratic majority might have been still greater.

Nevertheless, Richard Nixon was a valuable member of the Eisenhower team in the 1956 campaign. His most notable contribution seems to have been as a field strategist, a creator of party unity. He manifested a great capacity for inspiring workers at the precinct level. His own campaign tours were models of efficiency and thoroughness; his schedules were meticulously planned and rigorously followed. He was able to communicate to his followers something of his own assurance and unwearying physical drive. His frequent reports to headquarters in Washington, based on perceptive analyses of local situations, made possible the kind of closely knit, professionally managed campaign which delivers the vote on election day.

This is an important contribution. But it does not seem too much to expect that candidates for high office be concerned with party policy as well as political strategy. *The New York Times*, in endorsing the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket in 1956, expressed deep concern over Nixon's lack of "deeply rooted and consistently held principles." This is a serious shortcoming, regrettably apparent in the New Nixon, as in the old.

## V.

## SENATOR KEFAUVER

By Douglas Ehninger

1.

Despite the optimistic predictions of Mr. J. Howard McGrath and other of his more enthusiastic supporters,[1] it now seems likely that the results of last November's election struck a decisive blow at Senator Estes Kefauver's aspirations for high national office. If, indeed, this does prove to be the case, he will undoubtedly go down as one of the most indefatigable but least successful campaigners in the long annals of American presidential politics.

Again this year, as in 1952 when his bid to head the Democratic ticket was rejected after two convention ballots, no candidate worked harder to win voter support than did the senior Senator from Tennessee. Between Thursday, September 13, when he formally opened his campaign with a nation-wide radio-television address from Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and Tuesday, November 6, when he spent a last feverish morning electioneering in the streets and stores of downtown Miami, Senator Kefauver traveled 54,000 miles, delivered 450 speeches in 210 towns and cities in thirty-eight states,[2] held hundreds of press conferences, kissed a small regiment of co-eds, and established a handshaking and letter-writing record that may well endure for generations. A single day sometimes found him addressing as many as eleven different au-

[1] *Time*, November 12, 1956, p. 21.

[2] *Ibid.* See also *New York Times*, November 3, 1956.

diences in five or six towns. In a typical week he barnstormed through nine states. On another occasion he covered eight in five days.[3] Hardened correspondents fell by the wayside. Secretaries travelled in relays.[4] How the Senator himself, for all of his iron physique and burning ambition, was able to survive, and even apparently thrive on such labor must always remain a minor medical mystery.

Yet, despite this punishing schedule which, as one observer commented, kept him bouncing back and forth across the country like a self-propelled tennis ball, the Democratic presidential team, failing to share in the general success of its party on the local level, lost more or less decisively in all but one of the thirty-eight states in which Senator Kefauver campaigned. In fact, not only was he unable to achieve his primary mission of warding off defeat in those agricultural areas where he was thought to be especially strong, but what for the practicing politician is, perhaps, the ultimate humiliation, he, like Mr. Stevenson, was unable to deliver his own state and county, and was even defeated in his own Chattanooga precinct of Lookout Mountain by the overwhelming margin of 789 to 163.[5]

2.

Aside from its sheer volume and apparent futility, what, perhaps, is chiefly striking about Senator Kefauver's campaign speaking is the strong appeal that it continued, as in the past, to have for certain types of farm and small-town audiences.[6] Throughout the campaign Democratic headquarters was constantly besieged by appeals from county chairmen in the farm states that the Senator be sent into their districts for at least one speech on dairy supports or beef prices. In October, Mike Di Salle, unsuccessful candidate for governor in Ohio, declared: "We could use him [here] everyday from now till election, and keep him busy all day long. We have eighty-eight counties, and there isn't one that doesn't want him."[7] James T. Blair, who won the gubernatorial race in Missouri, was even more specific: "Of all the candidates who have come into this state, Kefauver is the only one who actually picks up votes for me."[8]

But while this appeal was undeniably present, its causes tend to elude precise rhetorical analysis. About the only certainty is that it did not arise from adherence to textbook rules, for, more often than not, Senator Kefauver's ideas were stale generalities, his organization loose, his style colorless and heavily salted with bromides, his vocal delivery a mumbled Southern drawl, his gestures stiff and almost pitifully awkward, and his speeches lacking not only in emotional warmth but also in the barest essentials of proof and support.

The informal, off-the-cuff addresses that he gave to smaller unorganized crowds gathered at the airports and factory gates, and on the public squares, ran to a characteristic pattern and, for the most part, repeated the same small set of shopworn themes: the importance of the common man's having his "say so," the virtues of the Constitution, the importance of "progress," how we as a nation must face up to playing our part in the world, and the South's moral duty to accept and abide by the desegregation decision. In rural areas these "universal"

[3] Tampa *Tribune*, October 28 and November 2, 1956.

[4] Harold R. Martin, "The Mystery of Kefauver," *Saturday Evening Post*, June 2, 1956, pp. 28-29, 89-92.

[5] Tampa *Tribune*, November 7, 1956.

[6] See Waldo W. Braden, "Estes Kefauver," in "Political Speaking in 1952: A Symposium," ed. A. Craig Baird, *QJS*, XXXVIII (October, 1952), 292-295.

[7] *Newsweek*, October 15, 1956, p. 45.

[8] *New York Times*, October 20, 1956.

themes were nearly always interlarded with promises for full parity, lower interest on farm loans, more money for rural electrification, and food-stamp plans to wipe out surpluses. Before audiences of workingmen, where his appeal was also considerable, there were promises to abolish the "strike-busting provisions of the Taft-Hartley law," to guarantee a $1.25 minimum wage, and to "oust all anti-labor members of the NLRB." These constituted the fundamentals of what the Senator liked to refer to as his "cause," and they were presented in language of almost childlike simplicity: "The criterion of every vote I ever cast was whether it was good for the average citizen." "I want our farmers to have their place in the economic sun." "I'm against any law that will strike down the workingman." "I'm against monopolies and cartels that squeeze the little business man to death." "My whole political philosophy is one of progress."[9]

In structure and approach also, these speeches were extremely simple. Usually the introduction was a personal greeting; the conclusion, some such statement as this: "Nobody will try with a heart more full of devotion to accomplish these things than I. I hope you vote for me, and if you can't I hope you remember me in your hearts and prayers." Or, even more briefly: "Adduhlay and Ah need your hep."[10]

The more important prepared addresses, presented to formal audiences and frequently broadcast or televised, were somewhat more closely geared to the course of national and international events, and their subjects give the impression of having been, in considerable measure at least, dictated from party headquarters. Here the Senator's most used topics were anti-Nixonism, corruption within the administration, farm policy, the Republicans as the party of "privilege," halting H-bomb tests (with the unfortunate statement about "blowing the earth 16 degrees off its axis"), foreign affairs, and, of course, in the last days of the campaign, the Suez crisis.

Giving due weight to the antecedent impression created by his consistently liberal and pro-farm voting record during seventeen years in Congress,[11] and to what was admittedly a shrewd exploitation of "the belly and pocketbook issues," the fairest conclusion seems to be that Kefauver's strong appeal for rural—and to a lesser, though still notable degree, for labor—audiences grew principally out of the intangibles of his own peculiar *ethos*—out of the man himself, rather than what he said or the words he used to say it.

Theodore H. White has summed it up this way: "Huge, virile, blessed with inexhaustible animal strength . . . wholesome in appearance and simple in speech, the core of his magic is the ability to make almost anyone feel that politics is important . . . that you have a role to play in it; that he needs you; you count."[12] Others, putting it more briefly, simply said: "He's likable. People simply take to Kefauver." "He's sincere." He manifests "a bigness of spirit" conveyed by "means other than words." "Ordinary people, everywhere, lacking articulateness themselves, are drawn to him."[13]

[9] See especially *Time*, September 17, 1956, pp. 25-28 and *Newsweek*, October 15, 1956, pp. 45-47; cf. Theodore H. White, "Kefauver Rides Again," *Collier's*, May 11, 1956, p. 27; Martin, "The Mystery of Kefauver," p. 91.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] A complete tabulation is given in *The New Republic*, October 22, 1956, pp. 12-13. See also in this connection "The Economics of Seven Democrats," *Fortune*, July, 1956, pp. 74-77, 188-196; Douglas Carter, "Estes Kefauver, Most Willing of the Willing," *Reporter*, November 3, 1955, pp. 14-18.

[12] White, "Kefauver Rides Again," p. 26.

[13] *Newsweek*, October 15, 1956, p. 45; *New York Times*, October 20, 1956; Carter, "Kefauver Most Willing of the Willing," p. 15.

Moreover, these ethical factors, as displayed from the platform, were, we may be sure, very strongly bolstered by the Senator's customary pre- and post-speech activities—his mingling with the crowd, pausing to taste and praise a homemade pie or cake, to play checkers, to exercise his unusual talent for remembering names and faces, and, of course, to shake the hand of anyone who could be dragged within reach. These were as much a part of the typical Kefauver campaign speech as were the words spoken before the audience as a whole, and it was in these activities, rather than in formal address, that he appeared to find his natural element.[14] A relaxed, approachable, "folksy" campaigner—in manner casual almost to the point of diffidence—he acted more as if he were running for county sheriff than for Vice-President of the United States. In person-to-person contacts, he was, as all observers agree, able to project certain aspects of his personality that were somehow frozen in the process of speech-making, to arouse a warmth of response that he could seldom elicit from the platform.[15] Mrs. Kefauver explains it this way: "He thrives on campaigning. He relaxes at it. The people, crowding in on him, stimulate him. He really enjoys what most people would find torturing."[16]

Contrasting sharply, however, with this appeal that Kefauver's rhetoric, as enhanced by personal greetings and informal conversations, had for some groups, was the marked antagonism that it aroused among other segments of voters. In fact, this was so strong that in some quarters he came, as *The New Republic* justly complained, to be caricatured into "a sort of half-witted, wandering minstrel, strumming away on a one-string banjo . . . a clod, a sleepwalker, a handshaking machine. Something for laughs or pity."[17] Even where the reaction was not so violent, certain deficiencies in his speaking that apparently were overlooked by rural voters gave rise to rather widespread unfavorable response. When a group of some fifteen trained critics were asked to evaluate his rhetoric, almost without exception they complained of his "lack of invention," his "notably deficient . . . intellectual stock," his "painfully oversimplified proposals," his lack of "sparkle," his "unbelievably poor audience adaptation," and the "weakness of his composition."[18] Of an appearance he made on the Dartmouth campus, Herbert James writes: "He was a failure, and he knew it."[19] Much the same may be said of a speech delivered at the University of Florida during the state primary. In the Senate he has for years

[14] *United States News and World Report*, August 24, 1956, p. 49.

[15] White, "Kefauver Rides Again," p. 26.

[16] Martin, "The Mystery of Kefauver," p. 92. The Kefauver handshake has, of course become legendary. Rhetorically considered, it is, however, probably more important for its quantity than for its quality. Although it could greet as many as 5,595 voters in a single hour, it has been described as feeling like "a big, wet dishrag." By general concensus, it is not a genially "bone-crushing or even firm" grip, but rather a sort of impersonal, mechanical action, in which as the Senator's right hand is extended, the left "applies a slight pressure to the elbow of the well-wisher," thus keeping the line moving at a steady pace. Moreover, it is usually performed without the benefit of eye-contact, the Senator's owlish gaze being directed straight ahead to a point well above the shakee's hat. See especially *Time*, September 17, 1956, p. 26.

[17] *The New Republic*, October 22, 1956, p. 11.

[18] Critics who kindly responded with thumbnail evaluations of Kefauver's campaign speaking were Paul Brandes, Mississippi Southern College; M. G. Christophersen, University of South Carolina; Lionel Crocker, Denison University; Leslie Davis and Ralph Eubanks, University of Arkansas; Huber Ellingsworth, Michigan State University; James Golden, Pasadena College; H. F. Harding, Ohio State University; Herbert James, Dartmouth College; Robert Jeffrey, University of Virginia; Ray Keesey, University of Delaware; W. M. Parrish, University of Florida; Lindsey Perkins, Brooklyn College; H. H. Perritt, University of Alabama; and Joseph Wetherby, Duke University.

[19] Herbert James to the writer, Hanover, New Hampshire, November 20, 1956.

generally been known as the "dinner bell" of the press gallery.[20]

3.

The marked discrepancy with which his efforts were received by different types of listeners suggests the essential narrowness and inflexibility of appeal that were, perhaps, the principal rhetorical characteristics of Senator Kefauver's campaign speaking. In those situations where his *ethos* was congenial to the mores and habit patterns of the audience and where he was able to exploit his very considerable talents for person-to-person electioneering, he was warmly and even enthusiastically received; in situations where his *ethos* was not spontaneously persuasive and where extensive personal contacts were not possible, the defects of his speaking in the realms of proof and style, no longer camouflaged by ethical factors, stood out so glaringly as to undermine the effectiveness of his appeal.

While such inflexibility is not, of course, uncommon among speakers whose strengths are rooted primarily in ethical sources, one senses that in Senator Kefauver's case, it may be more the result of deliberate cultivation than of an inherent deficiency in the range of rhetorical ability. Not only has he more than once expressed a personal conviction that in the heat of a political meeting one must put forth only the simplest and most fundamental of ideas in the plainest language and manner possible, but, as a study of his printed speech texts will show, in other situations he has often proved himself to be capable of a type of speaking that requires both intellectual stature and moral courage.[21] Indeed, to suggest that the picture he typically gave of himself on the stump was either accurate or complete would, at best, be a serious over-simplification.[22]

The fact of the matter appears to be that in his campaign speeches Senator Kefauver habitually employed only part of his range, deliberately using those particular methods and techniques which had not only so often proved successful in Tennessee, but which had also won him wide voter support in 1952 in the primaries and in Minnesota in the spring of 1956. Moreover, it is certain that this is exactly what the Democratic high command, hampered by inadequate funds for numerous nation-wide radio and television speeches, wished him to do; that his assigned part in the division of rhetorical labor was to travel the back roads to the country crossings, while the suave and patrician *ethos* of Mr. Stevenson was reserved more for the nation in general and the so-called intellectual or "egg-head" elements, in particular.[23]

Whether Senator Kefauver's campaign speeches, as thus shaped by his own preference and the specific assignment of his party's strategists, won or lost votes is something that can fairly be determined only in the perspective of time and after an exhaustive analysis of all of the political and rhetorical factors involved. Even in the short-term view, however, there arise two groups of questions that are interesting and perhaps significant for the student of public address: First, to what extent was the decision that the Senator devote him-

[20] Carter, "Kefauver, Most Willing of the Willing," p. 14.

[21] A good example is "Loyalty and Security Programs," delivered before the Unitarian Laymen's League, All Souls' Church, Washington, D. C., January 5, 1956. See *Vital Speeches*, February 15, 1956, pp. 282-285.

[22] See especially Theodore H. White, "Kefauver Rides Again," pp. 26-28 and William Dykeman, "Too Much Talent in Tennessee," *Harper's*, CCX (March, 1955), 51.

[23] See, for example, "How the Democrats Plan to Win," *United States News and World Report*, August 17, 1956, pp. 25-29.

self chiefly to exploiting his peculiar *ethos* for certain groups, perhaps in the end largely self-defeating? Did it require that he travel so incessantly to reach so many widely scattered small audiences in all parts of the country that his speaking was destined to suffer from the ill effects of almost continuous overexertion? While not excusing the lack of emotion or absence of logical proof, does the fact that he somteimes addressed as many as eleven audiences in one day, explain the repetition of ideas, the poor composition, the fragmentary arguments, and the frequently heard complaint that when reading a speech from manuscript he seemed to be looking at it for the first time? Is it not possible that the harder he labored in order to exploit his *ethos,* the more his speaking came to lack those very ingredients that were required by the more critical and discerning sort of listener?

Second, was it wise to assume, as Senator Kefauver and the Democratic generalship seemed to do, that rhetorical techniques and methods which had admittedly worked well on the state level would also work equally well on the national level? Or is the mass of voters who must be reached and persuaded if one is to win a presidential race today so vast that a candidate must of necessity depend more upon broad mass appeals than upon isolated whistle-stopping methods? As a number of commentators have observed, there is much about the Democratic campaign as a whole that suggests a misplaced emphasis in this respect.[24]

These are questions that future rhetorical critics, concerned with learning more about the science of public persuasion, may well find it profitable to pursue.

[24] James Marlow, "The World Today," syndicated AP column, November 15, 1956; *New York Times,* October 20, 1956.

## VI.

## THE POLITICAL MOTIF OF '56

By Ernest J. Wrage

"In an ideal democracy," Lord Bryce remarked, "every citizen is intelligent, patriotic, disinterested. His sole wish is to discover the right side in each contested issue and to fix upon the best man among competing candidates. . . . while his own zeal is sufficient to carry him to the polling booth."[1]

Bryce—no political babe in the woods—knew he was picturing an Adamic state of political innocence before sin reared its ugly head. In reality, campaigns before Bryce and since have been tailored in the main to fit the political sloth and limitations of voters. With exceptions, campaigns have tended to be trivial, often orgiastic, boss and machine ridden.

Although contemporary campaigns do not break abruptly with the past, recent contests do manifest a new stage in the art of mass manipulation, made possible by a developing technology of social control.[2] The phrase, "the engineering of consent," appropriately expresses what a campaign is all about. Accordingly, the notion of the pre-election period as a season for political re-

[1] From Bryce's preface to M. Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties* (New York, 1922, I, xliv-vlv).

[2] For an informative treatment of the subject, see Stanley Kelley, Jr., *Professional Public Relations and Political Power* (Baltimore, 1956). See also Kelley, "P. R. Man: Political Mastermind," *The New York Times Magazine,* September 2, 1956, p. 10ff.

view, education, and sober weighing of choices is progressively reduced to the status of pious myth. Certainly the campaign of 1956 offers more as a study in the merchandising of politics than it does as a study of a great debate.

"The Public-relations man and the advertising agency," asserts Senator Neuberger, "have become as influential in our political life as they have been for years in our super-market life."[3] To a greater or lesser degree, both of the major parties have come to rely on Madison Avenue. In addition to their own staff of specialists, the Republicans in 1956 retained the services of two of the most powerful advertising firms: Batten, Barton, Durstine, and Osborn for the National Committee; Young and Rubicam for the National Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon. These masterminding firms were supplemented by smaller outfits for field work. The Democratic party had to be content with a single, small firm—Norman, Craig, and Kummel, and with mavericks loaned by major organizations on the Avenue. The more limited use of such professional services by the Democrats is explained in part by scruple, in part by their shaky exchequer, and more substantially by the attitude of advertising firms, who regarded a Democratic account as a liability.[4]

Stevenson's attitude toward employing specialists in mass communication was at least cautious. "No tricks," he admonished, then set about making hucksterism a campaign issue and Madison Avenue a term of opprobrium. Leonard Hall was of another mind. "Politics is business," he said with disarming frankness. "You sell your candidates and your programs the way a business sells its products."[5]

In some measure each of the national conventions reflected attitudes expressed by Stevenson and Hall. Although the mechanics of the Democratic convention were accommodated to electronics, and politics was interspersed with irrelevant showmanship, the significant and exciting moments were produced by the decision-making process itself. The Republican convention, as Hall acknowledged, was a staged production. This phantom affair served two purposes: to ratify decisions reached at headquarters and thereby create the illusion of unanimity within the party, and to build up the party's most marketable commodity—Dwight David Eisenhower. Hence, the history of the Republican convention is aptly summarized in two subheadings of a report in *The New York Times*: "Waiting For Ike"; "Ike's Here."

It is axiomatic in the public relations game that the star system in politics, like the star system in Hollywood, pays off. There was calculated risk in making the fortunes of the Republican party dependent upon the appeal of Dwight Eisenhower, but political realities urged this strategy. After a bitter internecine struggle in 1952, the party rejected its natural ideological leader—Robert Taft—in favor of an enormously popular war hero without political experience or views but who promised to lead the Republicans out of the desert in which they had wandered for twenty years. In office, Eisenhower's popularity proved durable despite the party setback in the congressional elections of 1954. Indeed, the Democratically controlled congress, by insisting that the Democrats were better political friends of the President's than were Republicans, con-

[3] Richard L. Neuberger, "Isn't There A Better Way To Elect A President?" *The Saturday Review*, October 27, 1956, p. 11.

[4] William Harlan Hale, "The Politicians Try Victory Through Air Power," *The Reporter*, September 6, 1956, pp. 16-20, *passim*.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

tributed to his popularity. Hence, Eisenhower was dissociated from partisan politics and politicians, and became a towering national figure, at once human and majestic. He did not command a fierce loyalty such as partisans accorded to FDR for party and programmatic leadership in an era of depression. Rather, Eisenhower simply mirrored the sunny countenance of an America supremely content with its prosperity.

But to the Republicans' distress, little of Ike's popularity rubbed off on the party; it remained the minority party, still suspect except in areas of its traditional strength, as elections of 1954 and continuous surveys showed. Early in his administration, Eisenhower fumed over his unhappy relationship with the Old Guard, and toyed with the notion of founding a third party.[6] He soon abandoned this naive notion and from time to time he encouraged the public to believe that the party was having its face lifted so as to deserve the label of Modern Republicanism.

In April, 1956, Eisenhower spoke to some eight hundred Republicans in Washington, D. C., opening his campaign with a broad-based appeal to "All Americans—Republicans, Independents, and sound-thinking Democrats," but the speech failed to produce a sharply etched image of New Republicanism. Even *Time* referred to the talk as a limpid, "give 'em heaven" effort. Herblock, cartoonist for *The Washington Post*, went beyond the event to satirize the substance of Ike's philosophy and speeches with his smashing hit, "Forward Crusaders." To a file of beefy cigar-smoking regulars, Ike is shown passing out banners bearing legends such as "Only God can make a tree," "M-O-T-H-E-R spells Mother," and "The Dog is a noble Animal."[7] Again at the San Francisco convention, Eisenhower essayed his views of Modern Republicanism in a speech inspired, if not furnished, by his then Undersecretary of Labor, Arthur Larson, author of *A Republican Looks at His Party*. The mildly liberal rhetoric of the speech was unmistakable, but so was the "me-tooism" overtone that had plagued Willkie in 1940 and Dewey in 1944 and 1948.

But it became evident, as the campaign progressed, that arguments in behalf of the Republican party, modern or otherwise, yielded small mileage. By mid-October, pundits repeatedly noted that the contest had settled into one between Ike and the Democratic party. In the Republicans' final radio-TV show on November 5, the party itself was mentioned only once in passing. And although Eisenhower, in the flush of his victory of November 6, spoke of his landslide as a mandate for Modern Republicanism, he ruefully acknowledged in his first press conference after the election that Americans had not been convinced that Modern Republicanism was a reality.

Nixon himself jettisoned arguments in behalf of party by insisting that "the Eisenhower program is bigger than the Republican party." This program—"Peace, Prosperity, and Progress"—was capsulized and sloganized on billboards, in tons of litter and literature, through speeches and spot announcements. Voters were asked to test its validity by their own observations and experience. Under which party were the last three wars fought? Who ended the Korean War? Can you deny an all-time high in employment, increased take-home pay, arrested inflationary trends, booming industry and business confidence? As for

[6] Robert J. Donovan, *Eisenhower: The Inside Story* (New York, 1956), pp. 142-53.

[7] *Time*, April 30, 1956, p. 22.

progress, note the extension of social security, civil rights, national unity. Democratic demurs at the Republicans' flagrant resort to *post hoc ergo propter hoc* were brushed aside. So were Democratic arguments that the absence of a hot war is not equivalent to peace, and that glaring disparities in wealth do not mean general prosperity. Scoffed an Orwellian-minded adman, "Peace is War? Prosperity is depression?"

So slight an impression did Democratic arguments make that the President's victory, barring personal catastrophe, was never seriously threatened. Yet the strategists, compensating as they were for a subdued treatment of party and issues, continued to maximize and extend the President's monumental prestige and popularity. The goal of the strategists was to capture the independent vote, bring out the stay-at-homes, and win over "discerning Democrats." The unanswerable question was how much campaigning could Eisenhower stand following a coronary attack and surgery for ileitis? Prior to the convention it was announced that the President would make no whistle-stop campaign, but would limit himself to five or six radio-TV speeches.

Between the San Francisco convention and September 19, the date of Eisenhower's first TV speech of the campaign, he depended mainly on the newsmaking value of his office. Headlines, of course, overshadowed reports of his press conferences. Nevertheless, these press conferences, as faithfully reported in *The New York Times*, offer a more authentic index to the mind and rhetoric of the President than do his formal speeches. In contrast to his unimpressive performances at these news conferences, the President's kick-off TV speech of September 19 revealed a poised, confident Eisenhower who had put behind him the bungling efforts of 1952, had mastered the medium under the expert tutelage of Robert Montgomery, had become a thoroughly competent oral reader. Shortly before the campaign ended, a poll of newscasters rated Eisenhower overwhelmingly the most effective radio-TV campaigner.[8]

Even so, the formal, studio TV speech failed to register and to exploit the President's magnetic personal power over people in face-to-face relationships. Mass meetings and rallies were scheduled as favorable settings for his amiable qualities and his wide-wide grin. On October 12, a new form was created to project the personality of the President. Selected neighbors from around the country gathered in Washington, purportedly to put questions to their President. The program may have been unrehearsed as advertised, but the participants were carefully culled to include anonymous individuals and celebrities who liked Ike, representing various ethnic and occupational groups. In a nice, informal, neighborly atmosphere, Ike opened with a reassuring statement about the Suez crisis. In turn, the "neighbors" stood up, ostensibly to put questions, and more importantly to outdo each other in an unabashed spilling out of hearts. In these exchanges of high sentiment and religiosity, the President was at his natural best. He loved every minute of it, he said, and his reactions were convincingly in line with his words.

Still another event illuminates the content of the campaign. Both Eisenhower and Stevenson were invited to speak at a plowing contest in Newton, Iowa. Although the occasion seemed to call for it, the President chose not to make a major farm policy speech. The fact that Iowa farmers were disenchanted

[8] *Broadcasting-Telecasting*, October 29, 1956, p. 60.

with the Benson farm program might have had something to do with it. What's more, Stevenson would have an opportunity to reply the next day. So Ike told the farmers he was not there to make a speech. He just wanted to talk over things. Throughout he sounded a neighborly, bucolic note. He spoke in favor of farmers and farming, of furrow and plow, of casting swords into plowshares—a well-considered riposte in the agrarian, isolationist Midwest. Everything considered, it was an incredible brush-off, yet the talk proved to be an enormously successful vehicle for projecting the Eisenhower personality. Moreover, as the motorcade "bubble-hopped" through central Iowa, the outpouring of sentiment, once the people were given a chance to see the President, was not lost on the strategists. As Walter Lippmann remarked, the campaign became less a great debate, more a great inspection.

Much has been said of the Eisenhower father-image. It was strikingly dramatized in a five-minute "hitch-hike" of the sort used by both parties to capture unwitting TV audiences at their nightly devotionals. A Washington taxi-driver, walking his dog one night, looked across the street at lights in the windows of the White House and ruminated out loud. Substantially the script ran: "Yup, Prince, my neighbor lives over there—Dwight David Eisenhower. He's thinking about me and all the other people tonight." There followed fast film sequences—soldiers marching, harvesting machines cutting luxuriant grain, smoke belching from factory chimneys, etc. Accompanied by soft organ music, the taxi-driver commented on large affairs and on the planetary scope of the President's mind. "Yup, Prince, that's my neighbor, Dwight David Eisenhower. I sure need him."

The Eisenhower build-up was consistent with the public's image of the candidate. The big surprise was provided by Nixon. With disarming generosity Nixon spoke of Stevenson as a fine man. "But," he continued in awesome tones, "it's just that he's not in the same league with the President. President Eisenhower is a man of destiny!" Independents and "discerning Democrats" wondered what manner of man is Nixon, one heartbeat from destiny. It seemed only yesterday that he had labeled Stevenson a "Ph.D. from Dean Acheson's College of Cowardly Communist Containment."[9] Democrats, palming their 1952 and 1954 scar tissue, had waited with cold fury for this, their year of revenge. Yet here they were, frustrated by a new Nixon.

New had become the operative word. The NEW look, NEW Republicanism, NEW Eisenhower, NEW Stevenson, NEW America. The new Nixon offended nobody—or almost nobody. Democratic arguments, belaboring the Nixon record, in part as an oblique reminder of the President's health, were blunted by the exemplary behavior of the new, modest, young man. His opponents were reduced to implying waspishly that the best evidence of Nixon's unreliability was his new-found respectability. The image of Nixon, hatchet-man, transformed into Nixon, statesman, was the miracle of the campaign.

The new Stevenson was something else again. Early in the campaign, he began to dismay his devotees, to delight his enemies. In 1952, he was widely received as the most refreshing political figure of his generation. His major addresses were applauded as noble and urbane experiments in campaign discourse, free from the cliché-ridden talk of conventional politics. After his defeat in 1952, many agonized Americans

[9] Quoted by Richard H. Rovere, "A Reporter At Large," *The New Yorker*, October 13, 1956, p. 162.

sent him letters, some of expiation for having voted against him. But 1956 was different. Although partisans were disappointed over his defeat, there was not the same outpouring of anguish. Lightheartedly, Americans shucked their accumulated glut of campaign impressions and returned to their favorite giveaway programs. Why the contrast? The answer resides in part in the apparent congeniality between the President and the times. No Democrat could have defeated him. Even so, the Stevenson of 1956 came to appear progressively as a diminished or damaged copy of the Stevenson of 1952. Whether or not Stevenson significantly compromised his standards is a moot point, but after his defeat in the Minnesota primary, the feeling got about that he had. "I failed to communicate," he said; and, along with Kefauver, forthwith he made communion with thousands of sweaty palms in the cities and hamlets of Florida and California in the greatest handshaking marathon in history. In his quest for the nomination, Adlai tried to embrace both southern conservatives and northern liberals—a tableau unattractive to both groups.

Stevenson's nomination was achieved by allying himself with party organization more successfully than he had in 1952, by espousing a moderate position on public questions, and by campaigning aggressively in the primaries. It was for him an unenviable position—this dependence upon a party which was no more than a collection of regional satrapies, each intent upon its own issues and candidates, with only a tepid feeling for Stevenson.

A campaign conducted as a popularity contest was anathema to Stevenson, both from honest conviction and because his race was hopeless on such terms. But if there were to be issues, it was up to Stevenson to define them, since neither Republicans nor the generality of Democrats evinced more than half-hearted, superficial interest in national issues. (It is noteworthy that Eisenhower, paying scant attention to Stevenson, never once referred to him by name, and dismissed his arguments as half-truths or irresponsible.) Stevenson's early speeches and position papers analyzed such public problems as the school crisis, unemployment, Republican preferential treatment of big business, deterioration of small businesses, the farm problem, and the like. The impact of his arguments was less than resounding for a number of reasons: a general state of public euphoria, Stevenson's own low-keyed presentation, and the narrow ideological distance between him and Eisenhower. With both candidates crowding the middle of the road, it was easy for Adlai's opponents to cast him in the role of carping critic.

In the middle of October, when Stevenson urged a re-examination of the draft and unilateral action to end the testing of H-bombs, a flurry of interest quickly gave way to resignation in favor of the authority of Ike, or to concern that Adlai was becoming desperate and irresponsible. Frustrated by the President's disinclination to debate issues, Stevenson appeared to be clutching for something dramatic with which to unhinge the public's devotion to Ike. For example, this may have accounted for Adlai's ill-considered charge that the President's emissary and brother had aided and abetted Peron. Even Stevenson's attacks upon the Administration's foreign policy created no stir. Peace was threatened, Adlai alleged, by the President's failure to deal imaginatively with present and potential conflicts, particularly in the Middle East. In the final days of the campaign, the logic of fast-

breaking events in Poland, Hungary, and the Suez area gave credence to Stevenson's charges, but ironically, added strength to the Eisenhower vote.

As the campaign progressed, Adlai's manner and matter betrayed the inner tension of a man warring between his natural inclination to call the terms, and the advice of professionals who were convinced that he had talked over people's heads in 1952. Rarely, in 1956, did his speeches have the sharp focus of '52, the clear singleness of purpose. True, there were sturdy talks and high moments, but in his effort to broaden the base of his appeal, Stevenson's voice lost some of the old, independent, triumphant ring.

If his '56 speeches lacked the pronounced philosophical cast of '52, neither did Stevenson compensate with a fighting rhetoric. And, whereas Eisenhower learned to be adept before the camera, Stevenson was, if anything, less professional than in '52. When the crowd broke in to cheer a good sentence, Stevenson was already hurrying on to the next one. Interrupted by applause, he waited in an impatient and embarrassed manner. As evidence of defeat stared him in the face, a tone of aspirate resignation crept into his voice.

What then is significant in the Stevenson legacy? Stated negatively, his was a case against a rudderless ship of state, floating casually in a sea of complacency. In positive terms, his case for the NEW America was a plea for qualitative democracy in which concern for the culture of the mind replaces affection for the face of the nation. New problems are ever in the making, change is the law of life, and the test of our worthiness as a free people resides in the energy we muster and the values we foster in attacking the ancient problems of material existence and in venturing upon new frontiers of our inner life. "It is our mood that is the issue in this election," Stevenson declared.

The single and overriding purpose of parties and campaigns, say those who call themselves realists, is to win office and power. The devotee of qualitative democracy recoils from the raw power theory. His protests originate in a lingering attachment to the classical concept of a campaign as a kind of national town meeting in which the consent of the governed follows upon a serious and rigorous debating of issues. His political conversation is sprinkled with revealing phrases—debate, voice of the people, the bar of public opinion. We hear nostalgic murmurs for a revival of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. In Stevenson's acceptance speech of 1952, he voiced the problem that vexed thoughtful millions: "What does concern me, in common with thinking partisans of both parties, is not just winning this election, but how it is won, how well we can take advantage of this quadrennial opportunity to debate issues sensibly and soberly."

Admittedly, Stevenson's appeals seem to echo as a cry in the political wilderness. Yet each points up an uneasy state of mind that exists here and there and in varying degree of intensity, over the merchandising of politics. Each fosters and sustains the conviction that a mature democracy cannot be constructed by means of a technology for the engineering of consent. Speaking from the experience of two campaigns, Stevenson ruefully acknowledged that "ours is a society that makes its decisions more by sudden impact than by deliberate thought, reason and debate." The antidote? "We must maintain the dialogue of democracy to do justice to our system of government."[10]

[10] John B. Oakes, "Visit With Private Citizen Stevenson," *The New York Times Magazine*, November 25, 1956, p. 12ff.

# SPEECH: THE LIFE OF A DIPLOMAT

Ben C. Limb

WHAT does a diplomat do? Well—for one thing, he makes speeches. He also writes philosophical interpretations of governmental theory for scholarly quarterlies, factual analyses of trade and production data for economic weeklies, tender and pathetic accounts of courage among the war refugees (and what diplomat lacks them in these times?) for the house organs of the great charitable organizations, commentaries on the equipoise of military power as it affects his country for some of the numerous magazines specializing in ground or sea or air warfare, and forecasts concerning domestic and international politics for the elite monthlies. And he does not overlook occasional brief pieces for such special periodicals as those issued by boys' clubs, milk dealers, aluminum manufacturers, and the association of tobacco auctioneers.

And when he isn't writing, he speaks. He speaks at formal assemblies of the United Nations and at special international conferences to which his Government may appoint him a delegate. He speaks informally to small delegations that visit his office to present a gift, a petition, or a resolution of commendation on some stand recently taken by his Government. He speaks to women's clubs, to men's service luncheons, to colleges and to grade schools, to the annual banquets of labor unions and bankers, to community forums which have question periods, and on radio and television discussion panels where he is the bull's-eye in a target aimed at by several of "the nation's leading news analysts." He speaks to boys' clubs and to girls' clubs, to church groups and to investors' syndicates, to county fairs and to select dinner meetings of leading financiers. He talks to Congressmen, and State Department officials, and other Ambassadors, and Executive-Secretaries of organizations ranging from Infuriated Taxpayers Arrayed Against Foreign Aid to Aroused Citizens Militantly Marshalled to Defend International Democracy.

For several hours each day he sits at his desk writing letters. He writes to learned professors whose lifetime specialty is the inter-relationship of the vowel system of his national language with that of the Seminole Indians, and to returned servicemen who want to know the name and address of an orphan-child photographed with a big smile while receiving a can of GI rations on a cold street corner during the terrible winter retreat. He writes to lonely and warmhearted couples who would like to adopt a child from his country, and to business opportunists who think his people ought to provide an ideal market for a newly invented gadget. He writes to the Den Mother of Cub Scouts in a South Dakota village who wants a list of eleven grade-school children in his country who can and wish to correspond with her charges (in the English language). And he writes scores of thank-you letters to the many

*Dr. Ben C. Limb, educated in Korea and at the Mt. Hermon School and Ohio State University in th U. S. A., is Ambassador of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations. He holds the honorary LL.D. from Gustavus Adolphus College and Fairleigh Dickinson University.* *This popular address contains an especially significant commentary on calculated ambiguity in the public address of diplomats.*

people who express admiration for the courage of his countrymen in resisting aggression.

He also dines. He attends formal dinners given by other ambassadors on the occasion of their national holidays. (Every one of the eighty-odd nations has at least two or three holidays which merit attendance by top-ranking representatives of all the nations with which they have friendly relations.) He attends special luncheons which feature the unique dishes of various countries or of regional or cultural groups in the United States. He goes to cocktail parties and afternoon teas. He goes on picnics and excursions. He accepts invitations for breakfasts and for midnight snacks. And between times he follows a rigorous diet to keep his weight from becoming more than he can carry around.

And he travels! His secretary keeps on file the schedules of airlines, trains, buses, and ferryboats (with notations of deviations from the schedule on Sundays and holidays). He is in New England for a meeting one evening, and in Illinois (on the way to California) for another meeting the next day. He dashes through traffic in Washington and New York, and flies above storm clouds over Minnesota. And he carries a portable dictaphone so he can keep up with his correspondence while en route.

Between times he works on incoming and outgoing reports, conducts conferences, makes lavish use of the telephone, and studies endless reams of data in connection with projects assigned to him by his Government. He reads an assortment of ministerial reports and of daily newspapers from his own country, to keep up to date on what is happening and on the tenor of opinion of his own folks back home; and he reads even more newspapers of the country to which he is accredited so that he can send back summary reports of opinion for the guidance of his own Government. He administers his own staff, and he worries about the inadequacies of his own office budget.

Finally—and by no means least important—he studies. His desk is surrounded by almanacs, dictionaries, encyclopedias, histories, a selection of new books, and standard reference works. He tries not to be ignorant of cultural developments in his own country in the twelfth century or of the possible influence of new industrial techniques in affecting production of basic commodities important for his nation's trade or domestic consumption. He knows that at any moment he may be asked for an opinion concerning a little-known writer of his own homeland or about a foreign commentary on his country's political developments. He will be expected to know the status of the religious development, the figures on coal-mining, the adequacy of technological training programs, and the problems of commercial fishing in his homeland. The questions sometimes will reveal an appalling ignorance which requires of him a background lecture to set the facts in perspective; and sometimes he will be queried by an expert who has just completed a scholarly treatise on some obscure facet of his national dramaturgy.

With such a program, the serious question arises as to how an ambassador lives. If he is not a bachelor, he has a wife and perhaps several children whom he loves and with whom he would like to have a certain amount of normal family life. The chances are that his children are sent away to boarding schools, where they will be relieved of the daily disappointments of home appointments broken by the demands of

official duties. His wife either retreats into a lonely world of her own, or adapts herself to a round of continuously unexpected visitors and visiting. The family medicine chest accumulates a huge collection of cures for indigestion and insomnia. Since ambassadorial salaries are not large, serious family discussions are held on the clothing budget, the servant problem, and how to devise cheaper vacations. And since the ambassador (and his wife) must always be poised, pleasant, and alert in public, he (and she) very likely will be moody, irritable, and occasionally depressed in the privacy of their apartment.

Diplomacy is a mad profession. But that madness is madness with a system. Wherever he goes and whatever he does, the ambassador is the titular representative of his Government. While on duty (and he is always on duty) he is the alter ego abroad of his President. Whatever he says is official governmental policy. How he comports himself determines to a large degree the attitude of the people he meets toward his own people at home. Nor can he escape from the difficulties by saying nothing, for "no comment" on crucial issues (and what issue is not crucial these days to some segment or other of the public or of officialdom?) can often be more devastating than even a fumbled malapropism.

It follows, then, that diplomacy is above all a profession of words—written and spoken. Diplomacy should be listed among the categories of the literary and oratorical professions—somewhere midway between the serious essayists and the lyric poets, or between the commemorative orators and the after-dinner speakers. And still another sublisting should be entered under Conversation: Formal and Informal. Above all, and in multitudinous ways, the diplomat is a man of words.

He talks—and he also listens. He listens with dubious caution to earnest crusaders who seek him out to pour into his ears detailed suggestions of what they consider brilliant solutions for what they are certain are fundamental problems confronting his country. He listens with agreeable pleasure to complicated jokes—which may not be as fresh to him as they are to the narrator. He listens with educated discrimination to discussions of aesthetic influences upon the art and literature of his nation. He listens with perceptive acuity to veiled hints of policies not yet ready for public announcement—and many of which are pure fabrications of the diplomatic rumor factory. He listens to comments on international affairs heard in snatches in elevators, in restaurants, and on street corners—and tries to estimate to what extent they may represent widespread public opinion. He listens to the words of guests who have been invited so that they may meet in person the "distinguished ambassador" — or "that man who has been making all those terrible statements."

Yes, he listens, he studies, he confers. And then (frequently after midnight) he goes into his study and prepares what he shall say the next day. And at this point he becomes a literary figure with a difference. For oftentimes his main concern is not to set down in clear and simple language a statement of facts so obvious that it cannot be misunderstood (which I believe is one of the hallmarks of great writing). Quite to the contrary, his purpose often is to concoct an ambiguous composition which —no matter how carefully it may be analyzed—will add up to no real meaning whatsoever.

One of the distressing themes of which editorial writers are fond is a

ringing plea that diplomats should try to master the art of plain and straightforward talk. This theme is peculiarly distressing to diplomats, for it represents a basic misunderstanding of one of their greatest contributions to humanity.

Diplomats (to use a somewhat strained analogy) are grease on the wheels of a Rube Goldbergian machine of disconnected and clashing international machinery. The clearest and most simple fact of international affairs is that they are, indeed, *inter*-national. Governments are instituted to serve their own people; and every Government has a people of its own to serve. Each Government aims at the achievement of its own purposes—and sometimes these purposes clash.

Disputes between and among governments are far from uncommon, even when the relationships of the peoples involved are basically friendly and cooperative. Differences exist on all manner of policies—ranging from the recognition of Red China to the interpretation of fisheries rights on the open seas. There are varying problems and points of view on the timing of policies that are in agreement, and on the wording of minor clauses in major documents. There are disputes on questions which are imbedded in the domestic politics of one or all the nations concerned. There are disputes which could lead to temporary irritation and there are disputes which could result in war.

The diplomat, let it never be forgotten, represents a sovereign nation. And there are no nations which are not sovereign. There are treaties and alliances which represent temporary and partial surrenders of some modicum of sovereignty. There is the United Nations, where some eighty nations meet around council tables to talk about questions of common interest. There is a growing climate of internationalism and a growing sense of global inter-dependency. There are trans-national influences, such as religion and trade. But there remain separate governments, each, as Mark Twain might have said, with its own fish to fry.

And in the midst of this clashing dissonance of diverse purposes and methods there stands the little group of ambassadors busily (and necessarily) applying the lubricant of ambiguity.

All of the people (and their name is legion) who deliver themselves periodically of lectures to the diplomatic corps on the presumed virtues of plain speaking should be sent back to school. And when they are settled down as a captive audience in a classroom, some dispassionate professor should lecture to them, with a host of specific examples, on what the results would be if all diplomats should always express clearly and forthrightly precisely what their own governments believed and desired.

As a specific instance (and these are always dangerous!) what should be the reply of an "under-developed" nation's ambassador to a question asked in a public forum about some phase of the administration of American aid funds with which his Government happened to be seriously displeased? Should he describe clearly just what it is in the program that his Government dislikes —and thereby risk arousing resentment and perhaps contribute ammunition to a minority group that wants to end all foreign aid? Or, on the other hand, should he clearly and unmistakably endorse the entire program (in order to win support for it), thereby undermining the efforts of his Government to secure some revisions? Obviously, it seems to me, he should do neither. On the contrary, he should deliver himself of sentiments which will seem to be sufficiently explicit to satisfy the question, but in such circumlocutions that the

sentiments expressed could not possibly be understood.

The real purpose of such ambiguities is to mask and minimize disagreements while experts are hard at work behind the scenes trying to eliminate their causes. So long as the separate sovereignty of nations is preserved, this will inevitably be a considerable part of the diplomat's job. It simply cannot be otherwise. When an occasional inexperienced or unskilled diplomat overlooks this essential fact, the consequences are immediate, most unpleasant, and often serious. Later explanations never quite catch up with the original *faux pas*.

The serious study of diplomatic speech is still, unfortunately, in its infancy. Diplomats perforce must hammer out their own rules in the midst of their day-by-day duties. Experience has to be interpreted rapidly, for the conditions and even the rules of international conferences are constantly changing.

Just a few years ago diplomacy was conducted by leisurely gentlemen who wore striped trousers and morning coats and sat in impressive offices conducting infrequent and genteel conversations. Occasional written communications (often handwritten by the ambassador himself) were exchanged between governments whose affairs seldom interlocked. As for public appearances, the old-time diplomat (and not so old as we might think) was expected to do no more than deliver polite and inconsequential after-dinner speeches composed chiefly of refurbished jokes. When international conferences were held, they were behind locked doors and the public did not expect ever to hear any more about them than the conclusions finally formulated into policies.

The global telegraphic network, radio, the movie news camera, the airplane, and television have wrought changes that are still occurring at a dizzy pace. Nowadays, "closed conferences" are about as open as a community sewing bee. Everything that is said, how it is said, and who says it are known to all who are interested within a few minutes or hours. Moreover, diplomats nowadays talk not only to one another, but to the public in the nation to which they are accredited. And the accumulation of all the instantaneous information that is now available, plus the sense of world community created by modern transportation and communication, has aroused an interest in practically anything that happens anywhere. Diplomacy in our time is conducted on an open stage.

It should not be assumed, however, that a diplomat must always be ambiguous. Occasions also frequently arise when what he must strive for above all else is to secure a clear and correct understanding of a governmental policy or of conditions within his own country. And this, too, presents problems.

For example, a delegation of labor-liberals may visit his country and upon their return may secure wide publicity for views critical of the working conditions which they observed. They, of course, are not experts on the conditions in the country they have visited. And what they have to say is addressed primarily to their own home constituency, to impress upon their followers and their own Congressmen the sincerity of their determination to achieve "good" conditions for workmen. So far so good.

However, an incidental result of their publicized criticism is a lessening of respect and friendship for the nation which they have criticized. Often the facts they cite may be correct in themselves, but are decidedly out of focus in terms of the general economic, social,

and political conditions within which those facts must necessarily exist. Long working hours, for instance, have always been inseparably connected with lack of machines. Low wages are correlated with low prices. Just as in the United States, advances in labor conditions have to be related to general advances of technology. The slow process of education is required to train an expert body of technicians. Laws have to be revised by legislatures which are subject to periodic election campaigns. Money has to be found for investment in new modes of productivity. Bad conditions do not exist because anyone desires them, but are inherent in complicated situations that require widespread and often gradual remedial action. All of this needs to be explained.

And it needs to be explained to a public that will read a headline charging that the work-week is too long, but will not read a three-thousand word article explaining why. Notoriously, it is easy to criticize and difficult to educate.

The foreign correspondents of American newspapers face this same problem when they seek to write dispatches on complicated political situations (and politics are always complicated). They seek to escape from their dilemma by using catch-phrases, such as "rightist," "liberal," and "leftist," which their readers will understand, but which often only dimly if at all reflect the actual conditions they are supposed to explain. Under these circumstances, the ambassador is always goaded by his own sense of righteousness and by urgent messages from his home Government to "rectify" the misunderstandings.

Under such circumstances, the plight of the diplomat is akin to that of the public school teacher who heroically attempts to explain Einstein's quantum theory in simple terms that will be understandable to grade-school pupils. At least the teacher has a captive audience that has to listen and try to understand.

The diplomat, faced with this problem, seeks to phrase his own understanding of the essential facts in terms that will reflect conditions in his homeland accurately and at the same time will be interesting and understandable to the public of the nation to which he is accredited. He wracks his brain for a headline phrase which will be as instantly appealing as that used by his country's critics. And such phrases, under the circumstances, are not easily come by.

Now, if there are any readers left who have borne with me this far, it may seem to them that the diplomat faces an impossibly difficult job. Maybe so. It is certainly difficult enough so that no ambassador in his right mind expects to be more than partially and occasionally successful. But there also are rewards and compensations. The anterooms of national executives are seldom crowded with diplomats who are pleading to be relieved of their posts. On the contrary, most ambassadors appear to enjoy their jobs and are generally reluctant to leave them. Diplomacy, like printer's ink, gets in the blood and keeps the true professional devotedly at his tasks.

Perhaps the major appeal of the diplomatic profession is the sense it gives (partly correctly) that the ambassador is behind the scenes and on the inside in the unfolding of the great world drama of human affairs.

To a degree never before known, the ordinary lives of ordinary people are dependent upon international relations. Hot war, cold war, psychological warfare, trade, tourism, and many facets of daily living are interwoven with the relationships of nations. What decisions are made, and a portion of the processes

by which these decisions are reached, are public property. Every citizen can see pictures of the great statesmen meeting together, and can read "dope" stories by skilled news analysts on how their personalities interact.

But the diplomats, nevertheless, are a special club—a group set apart. They, and only they, can assess accurately the degree to which policies are affected by personalities and, sometimes, by sheer accidents. They can appreciate one another's difficulties in phrasing statements and in dealing with public reactions. They naturally develop a "clubbable" atmosphere among themselves. They know which diplomats violate the unbreakable rules of behavior, and which ones, with skill and ofttimes personal sacrifice, keep the gears from clashing unmercifully. In their own cocktail parties and private luncheons, they (like everyone else) often let down their hair and talk shop. And this helps them keep their perspective and balance.

What should we say to a young man or young woman who would like to get into the diplomatic service? The best advice is—don't! But if you must, start young and learn everything you possibly can: about your own country, about the world at large, present and past. Study languages, and above all study human nature. Learn to say what you mean—both so it can be understood and so it couldn't possibly be understood by anyone. Develop poise and ease in all social circumstances, under all manner of unmannerly provocations. Be interested in everyone and in everything.

More seriously, diplomacy is a profession for those who not only have the skills required but above all else have a dedicated sense of public service. The great problem of our age is how to restore justice in world affairs without the cost of war. The great need is to find some way of solving problems which in the past decade have largely been postponed. What humanity desperately needs is diplomats who will stand with courage for the ideals which represent the best in civilization—and will find a way of accomplishing them peacefully if possible.

The diplomat is far indeed from being the dilettante who specializes in personal charm. He is the instrument of humanity, charged with the successful achievement of tenable solutions to the issues of life and death. If he fails, the human race may fail. It is not a profession to be taken lightly, either by those who practice it or by those who dimly and distantly observe. It is this sense of mission which keeps the real diplomats—the representatives of free people—unwearyingly at their tasks.

• • •

# THREE RELIGIOUS ORATORS AND THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT

W. David Lewis

THROUGHOUT history, man has proved susceptible to magical formulas, battle-cries, catchwords, and slogans. The American sociologist Kimball Young once observed, "The masses love words and their emotional connotations. The stereotypes of prejudice and belief are more than mere symbols. They actually acquire a significance of the deepest sort."[1] A case in point is the fascination which the quasi-magical words "universal manhood suffrage" had upon the minds of the Chartists in nineteenth-century England. The inability of certain orators to reshape the philosophy of this movement with arguments and speeches that did not place this formula in the forefront suggests that Young's statement is valid when applied to the working masses of England caught up in the vortex of the industrial revolution.

The Benthamite reform movement which culminated in England in the suffrage extension of 1832 secured new political power for only a narrow group of propertied bourgeoisie. The working classes, crowded by the factory system into unsanitary, pestilential cities, struggling for meager wages, paying high prices for foodstuffs, and forbidden to ameliorate their condition by recourse to trades-unions, were thought of by their economic betters as creatures whose persistence and ambition did not equal the demands of the dawning business age and who had nobody to blame but themselves for their misfortunes. To them applied with full severity the strictures of Malthusian economics; and the only "reform" provided for their hardships was the New Poor Law of 1834, which sent unemployed artisans to workhouses designed to be "as like prisons as possible, and as uncomfortable as possible."[2]

The Reform Bill of 1832 nevertheless provided a certain amount of inspiration for the English working masses. The historian J. Salwyn Shapiro has noted,

> . . . the workers realized that the door to power in the state, though closed, was not locked. There was no need in England, as in France, for the workers to mount the barricade in order to obtain the vote. All that they needed to do was to demand it loudly, insistently—sometimes threateningly—and both parties would begin to outbid each other in their efforts to extend the franchise.[3]

Though such a generalization can be made only with a good deal of historical hindsight, it is none the less true that a certain amount of this faith lay at the core of the principles held by the Chartists in the fourth, fifth, and sixth decades of the nineteenth century. In three unsuccessful petitions to Parliament the laboring masses demanded a "Charter" which would grant universal manhood suffrage, voting by secret ballot, equal electoral districts, annual Parliaments, the abolition of property qualifications for members of Parliament, and the

*W. David Lewis is Instructor in Public Speaking at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.*

1 Kimball Young, *Social Psychology* (New York, 1930), pp. 392-393.

2 Edward P. Cheyney, *Modern English Reform* (Philadelphia, 1931), pp. 12-20, 125-131; Frank F. Rosenblatt, *The Chartist Movement in its Social and Economic Aspects* (New York, 1916), p. 47.

3 J. Salwyn Shapiro, *Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism* (New York, 1949), p. 220.

monetary remuneration of all such members.[4] Although the grievances from which the workers sought release were mainly economic, the means with which they attempted to relieve them were almost purely political; and while certain incendiaries tried to persuade the Chartists to become revolutionary, the movement's code of action remained essentially democratic. Furthermore, the efforts of such leaders as Feargus O'Connor to persuade Chartists to move toward such immediate ends as land reform, abolition of primogeniture, and child labor laws rather than place all their emphasis upon political goals were attacked as deviationist by those who believed in "pure" Chartist principles.[5] The heart of Chartist belief remained political and democratic throughout most of the movement's history; and certain speakers found that their influence with its members waned when their public addresses and arguments did not stress political goals or openly flouted them. Among these speakers were three Christian ministers: Joseph Raynor Stephens, Charles Kingsley, and Frederick W. Robertson. While each of these men espoused ideas and principles which retained a measure of significance outlasting the movement they were intended to influence, the reformers' short-range goals remained largely unfulfilled in that the Chartists for the most part rejected their counsels.

Despite the tendency of most branches of English religious opinion during this period to be conservative and anti-democratic, occasional ministers of the Gospel aspired to assist the working classes in their efforts to improve their conditions. One of the most extreme of these was Joseph Raynor Stephens, whose social philosophy embraced outright revolution. The minister son of a Methodist preacher, Stephens was too sympathetic to the plight of the worker to fit into the pattern of middle-class Wesleyanism which constituted his inheritance. Dismissed from the church in the early 1830's because of his incendiary oratory, this apostle of insurrection began holding quasi-religious, quasi-political services in three chapels which grateful workers erected for him in the Ashton district.[6]

Stephens was too radical to accept Chartist principles in unadulterated form. Suffrage, he thought, would never by itself solve the basic problems of the English poor; the whole economic structure of the nation would have to be turned inside-out to accomplish this, and Stephens envisioned himself "a revolutionist by fire, a revolutionist by blood, to the knife, to the death." Criticized by some Chartists as a "malignant crazy man who never seemed exhausted with bawling atrocious matter," he addressed his followers in the black robe of the clergyman, painting lurid pictures of women bleeding to death in factory districts, working people dying of starvation, and lower-class children in terror of the workhouse. One scholar has described him as the greatest Chartist orator:

> A master on the platform, he possessed personal magnetism, felicity of expression, and a singular style of oratory, which, at his best, made him irresistible. Vehement inflammatory declamations interwoven with passages of classical beauty; rugged expression of protest mingled with sentiments of love and devotion; scenes of revolting despondency redeemed by prophetic promises of a happy life; curses sputtered in a voice that could be distinctly heard by twenty thousand persons in the open air . . . all this

[4] S. MacCoby, *The English Radical Tradition, 1763-1914* (London, 1952), p. 131.

[5] Preston W. Slosson, *The Decline of the Chartist Movement* (New York, 1916), pp. 43-44, 72; Rosenblatt, *Chartist Movement*, pp. 110-111, 123.

[6] For biographical detail on Stephens see Rosenblatt, *Chartist Movement*, pp. 122-124; and Mark Hovell, *The Chartist Movement* (London and New York, 1908), pp. 90-91, 97.

rendered his spell the more dominant because of the spectacular effect produced by the black robe of the minister of the Gospel.[7]

A typical example of the breathless and repetitious but exceedingly vivid rhetoric of this clerical demagogue was a sermon preached in the Ashton district on May 26, 1839.[8] The opening passages of the speech contained a vision of class warfare worthy of a Marx or an Engels:

> Yesterday, the Whigs of Ashton, the Malthusians of Ashton . . . the tools of the Poor Law Commissioners of Ashton—yesterday they were standing on the tiptoe of expectation; they were waiting—they had been praying to Mammon, their God, to Moloch, the Deity, in whom they delight—they were praying to Mammon and Moloch that the women and men of Ashton might have their blood shed on Kersal Moor. But God has disappointed them.

Thus equating the cause of the working man with the cause of God and castigating the upper classes as heathen, Stephens urged the poorer people to form into cell groups and make up their minds to "shed the last drop of their blood rather than live in bondage, and sell their wives and children to the Devil." This was followed by one of the preacher's characteristically fierce statements:

> Down with the House of Commons; down with the House of Lords; aye, down with the throne, and down with the altar itself; burn the church; down with all rank, all dignity, all title, all power; unless that dignity, authority, and power will and do secure to the honest industrious efforts of the upright and poor man, a comfortable maintenance in exchange for his labor.

The speech here begins to show Stephens' inability to capitalize on the basic ideology of Chartism. It dwells not upon the suffrage but upon the economic factor of "a comfortable maintenance." This departure from the dominant belief of the movement becomes more apparent as the orator tactlessly disparages the political panacea held so essential by the masses:

> I don't care about your Charter; it may be all very right; it may be all very good; you have a right to get it, mind you, and I will stand by you in it; but I don't care about it; and I don't care about a republic. . . . I don't care about the present, or any order of things, unless the Charter, the republic, the monarchy, the present order of things, or any other order of things that may be brought to succeed the present, should, first of all, and above all, and through all, secure to every son of the soil . . . a full, a sufficient, and a comfortable maintenance. . . . That is what I go for; that is what I talk for; that is what I live for; that is what I will die for; for I will have it.

These statements, explicitly subordinating matters political to matters economic, were fundamentally antithetical to the spirit of the movement which Stephens was attempting to influence. His disdain for the suffrage problem or for political reform constituted his fatal weakness as a protagonist for labor, because he could not identify himself with that which the masses of 1839 valued most. The Ashton speech continued with stinging revolutionary sentiments, with denunciatory passages contrasting God's goodness with alleged capitalistic tight-fistedness, with hatred for the ruling classes; but the orator had clearly shown why he was only temporarily the idol of the masses. "It was heresy," states a close student of the Chartist movement, "that drove him to the Chartists and it was the same heresy that barred him from their ranks. The chief protagonist and pillar of insurrectionism, he was the first to be singled out for persecution by the government

[7] Rosenblatt, *Chartist Movement*, pp. 122-124.

[8] The most nearly complete available text of this sermon is printed in *The London Democrat*, June 8, 1839, which summarizes those sections which it does not quote verbatim. Rosenblatt, *Charist Movement*, pp. 130-132, quotes extensively from this address.

and to be denounced by the leaders of the movement."[9]

Far different from Stephens but just as unable to identify himself with the basic spirit of Chartism was the noted broad-church divine, Charles Kingsley. Relying more upon feeling than acute analysis and observation, this clergyman was a constant, frequently mercurial, joiner of one cause and another. At various points in his career he agitated for female rights; inveighed against Roman Catholicism; hurled defiance at his arch-enemy, Cardinal Newman; espoused "Christian Socialism"; and defended Darwinism. Characteristically, he had a brief fling at being an advocate of Chartism.[10]

No amount of crusading ardor, however, could make Kingsley embrace the fundamental ideology of the workers' movement. He held that the difficulties of the poor could not be corrected by such a panacea as universal manhood suffrage. Desperate economic conditions, thought Kingsley, had forced the workers to compensate for their wretchedness by taking part in wanton behavior and sinful pleasures; and these had in turn lowered the moral stature of the English lower classes to the point where they were for the most part unfit to participate in the governmental process. Reform must come from above before it could come substantially from below. The ruling classes must forsake their self-seeking ways; bad economic conditions must be eliminated; the working masses would thus be relieved of their squalor, and, eschewing their sinful indulgences, be qualified to play a significant part in the political life of the nation.[11] Such a philosophy underlay Kingsley's significant sermon, "The Message of the Church to Labouring Men."[12]

One of the greatest occasions in London in 1851 was the opening of a great exhibition in the Crystal Palace under the auspices of the Prince Consort. Crowds of people, including large numbers of the working classes, came to the capital city to view the exhibits. Close by the Crystal Palace was the Anglican church of St. John the Evangelist; and since many of the working men coming to London were presumed to be atheists, the rector of the church conceived the idea of holding special services for workers and inviting well-known preachers to speak on such occasions. Kingsley was one of these speakers, and chose as his text that portion of the fourth chapter of Luke containing the words, "to preach the gospel to the poor; . . . to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, . . . to set at liberty them that are bruised . . ."

Admitting that "The history of the Church, in every age, is full of sad tales of the sins of the clergy against the people," Kingsley nevertheless asked the assembled workers to realize that this was the fault of individual clerics and not of the church itself. Shortly after the sermon began he identified his conception of the mission of a clergyman with the three tenets of the French Revolution:

> I assert that the business for which God sends a Christian priest in a Christian nation, is to preach and practise liberty, equality, and brotherhood, in the fullest, deepest, widest, simplest meaning of those three great words: that in as far as he does, he is a true priest,

[9] Rosenblatt, *Chartist Movement*, p. 132.

[10] Margaret F. Thorp, *Charles Kingsley, 1819-1875* (Princeton, 1937), pp. 59-61.

[11] Harold U. Faulkner, *Chartism and the Churches* (New York, 1916), pp. 133-134; Bernard N. Schilling, *Human Dignity and the Great Victorians* (New York, 1946), pp. 96-102.

[12] *"The Message of the Church to Labouring Men," A Sermon . . . June 22, 1851*, by Charles Kingsley (London, 1851).

doing his Lord's word, with his Lord's blessing on him: that in as far as he does not, he is no priest at all, but a traitor to God and man . . .

Kingsley did not, however, use these words as a springboard to the advocacy of universal suffrage for the working classes. His conception of liberty was far different from that of the Chartists, and his idea of equality rested upon twin foundations of morality and economic opportunity. He first attacked huge aggregations of wealth:

All systems of society which favour the accumulation of capital in a few hands—which oust the masses from the soil which their forefathers possessed of old—which reduce them to the level of serfs and day-labourers, living on wages and, on alms—which crush them down with debt, . . . or deny them a permanent stake in the commonwealth, are contrary to the kingdom of God which Jesus proclaimed. . . .

There was much here that a working man could agree with; but Kingsley skirted the laboring-class desire for the vote and launched into a discussion of liberty which flatly made political power contingent upon moral improvement:

. . . of liberty there are two kinds; the false, as where a man is free to do as he likes; the true, as where a man is free to do what he ought—to do, in short, the will of his Father in heaven; and to do that, he must be free, not merely outwardly and politically, but inwardly in his spirit: that inward freedom must not be the consequence, but the cause and reason of his outward freedom; his heart must be free from all degrading passions; his mind must be free from all confusing falsehoods and prejudices, and then the freedom of his body and of his citizenship not only ought, but will follow as a matter of course.

Later in the sermon, Kingsley spoke disapprovingly of a conception of "false" equality, which "reduces all intellects and all characters to a dead level, and gives the same power to the bad as to the good, to the wise as to the foolish, ending thus in practice in the grossest inequality." It was obvious that the preacher's conception of political freedom did not square with Chartist ideology; and even in 1851, when the Chartists were becoming dubious of the possibility of immediate suffrage and were beginning to follow such leaders as Ernest Jones in advocacy of economic ends, Kingsley's slow and moralistic solution of the problems of the masses would naturally elicit little support from them. As it was, the sermon was too conservative for the workers and much too radical for the pastor in whose church Kingsley delivered it. This clergyman publicly disassociated himself from Kingsley's statements immediately after the address was finished, an occurrence with profound effect upon the workingmen present. They knew that Kingsley was interested in their problems; but the dissenting rector's statements convinced them that the Anglican Church as a whole was not. Henceforth many of them never looked to the church for help again.[13]

Kingsley himself ceased actively to associate with the Chartist cause following this trying experience. This is not to maintain that he was a man to desert a movement simply because of public censure or disapproval; the truth was, as his sermon made apparent, that he was never able to accept the basic Chartist idea to begin with. By 1855, he was convinced that only training and education could render the workingman fit to associate himself into an economically-reformed society; and when the Chartist movement finally passed away in the latter half of the decade, he did not lift his pen or voice to stay its death.[14]

A third clergyman who wished to be of assistance to the workers and their

[13] Thorp, *Charles Kingsley*, p. 85.

[14] Una Pope-Hennessy, *Canon Charles Kingsley* (New York, 1949), p. 116; Schilling, *Human Dignity and the Great Victorians*, p. 118.

cause was Frederick W. Robertson, rector of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. Vehement, sensitive, and possessed of a violent temper, Robertson was nevertheless possessed of an intelligent and an inquiring mind. Refusing to be dominated by any one school of thought, he was deeply in sympathy with the Chartists in many of their grievances; yet his independence of mind would not allow him to accept the tenets of the Chartist faith to any degree admissible to the movement's leaders. While he spoke at many Chartist meetings, the differences between his beliefs and theirs eventually proved insuperable.[15]

Kingsley believed that the problem of the workingman was both economic and moral, and that the amelioration of the economic problem would go far toward solving the moral one, in which case the worker could begin to participate more actively in national political life. Robertson believed that the workers' problems were economic and spiritual; and that the satisfactory solution of the spiritual problem, in which the rich shared also, would make the economic problem pale into insignificance. Suggestive of this philosophy was Robertson's sermon, "Christ's Judgment Respecting Inheritance," based, significantly, on the text, "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesseth."[16]

Christ, said Robertson, spoke severely against the selfishness of wealth while on the earth; so much so that He would be called a "mad, democratical, dangerous fanatic" should He appear and utter these criticisms in nineteenth-century England. Speaking with considerable historical perspective, Robertson declared the greatest problem before Europe to be, "Whether the present possessors of the soil have an exclusive right to do what they will with what they own, or whether a larger claim may be put in by the workingman for a share of the profits?" The clergyman's answer to the problem, however, would hardly satisfy the Chartists in particular or the English workers in general:

> . . . whether the soil of the country and its capital shall remain the property of the rich, or become more available for the poor, the rich and the poor remaining as selfish as before —whether the selfish rich shall be able to keep, or the selfish poor to take, is a matter, religiously speaking, of profound indifference . . . Fifty years hence what will it matter? But a hundred thousand years hence it *will* matter whether they settled the question by mutual generosity and forbearance.

The working classes, then, were selfish in their own way, just as their social and economic betters were. Furthermore, Robertson maintained, each class, low and high, was mistaken in trying to identify itself with God and God's purposes. The poor are right in demanding that the rich treat them as brothers; but so should the poor feel a certain sense of brotherhood and forbearance toward the wealthy:

> [Jesus] never was the champion of a class, because He was the champion of humanity. . . . It is a common thing to hear of the rights of man—a glorious and a true saying, but as commonly used, the expression only means the rights of a section or class of men. . . . One class appeals to the Bible, as if it were the great Arbiter which decrees that the poor shall be humble and the subject submissive; and the other class appeals to the same book triumphantly, as if it were exclusively on their side. . . . In either of these cases Christianity is degraded, and the Bible misused. . . .

In brief, England and its people, high and low, had fallen prey to covetousness and in their blindness had for-

[15] Richard Garnett, "Frederick William Robertson," *DNB*, XLVIII, 405; Faulkner, *Chartism and the Churches*, p. 78. See also John Tulloch, *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain During the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1886), Lecture VIII.

[16] The complete text of this sermon is in Frederick W. Robertson, *Sermons Preached at Brighton* (New York, n. d.), pp. 198-208.

gotten that they were brothers. Finally, Robertson stated that the rich man's wealth was a source of temporal blessing, but also a spiritual drawback:

> God is on the side of the poor, and the persecuted, and the mourners—a light in darkness, and a life in death; but the poverty, and the persecution, and the darkness are the condition on which they feel God's presence. They must not expect to have enjoyment of wealth and the spiritual blessings annexed to poverty at the same time.

If the working classes, then, would cultivate Christian virtues instead of seeking power, they would thereby choose the wiser course. Such a message could hardly appeal to the Chartists or their leaders. Kingsley had asked, "What is the use of talking to hungry paupers about heaven?" Robertson believed that it was of use, and his conception of his own role in the working-class movement was that of a comforter who might be able to convince the masses that their spiritual future would compensate for their impecunious present. This was a vain hope from the start, for it misread the total nature of the Chartist faith. By Robertson's own admission, "the Chartists refused to own him as a brother."[17]

Like Robertson, both Kingsley and Stephens failed in their own separate ways to divert or modify the main course of Chartist thought. The failure of each was due substantially to basic ideological factors. Chartism grew up around two primary ideas: that the middle and upper classes could not be counted upon to grant any real reform to the factory workers and the masses whom they represented, and that universal manhood suffrage and other political reforms were therefore the only solutions that would enable the workingman to gain the requisite power to work out his economic and social salvation. Stephens, Kingsley, and Robertson sympathized with the workers but had failed to embrace and expound in their speeches and sermons the political panaceas so important to the Chartist dogma. Their example is indicative of the difficulty encountered by a speaker in attempting to influence a popular movement unless he can appeal effectively to the ideologies, slogans, and catch-words which the movement holds most dear.

This is not to say, however, that the three orators experienced total failure in the long view of things. Though one of them, Stephens, may with justice be termed a demagogue, all three figures held certain ideas which could be defended with reason, vigor, and truth. In the cases of Kingsley and Robertson, the stress on moral, spiritual, and economic problems represented just as valid a facet of the problems of society in the industrial age as the Chartists' affirmation of political desirabilities. How much the sermons and speeches of the three clergymen contained of reason is beyond the scope of this essay. Insofar as they did contain it, they could have drawn support from a statement made some years later by an American philosopher. "Reason," said William James, "is one of the very feeblest of Nature's forces, if you take it at any one spot and moment. It is only in the long run that its effects become perceptible."[18]

[17] Faulkner, *Chartism and the Churches*, p. 78.

[18] William James, "Remarks at the Peace Banquet," *Atlantic Monthly*, XCIV (December, 1904), p. 845.

# THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

Loren Reid

A certain amount of good fortune comes to an individual through his own efforts. An even greater amount comes through the efforts of groups in which he is an active participant.

At the beginning of a new year we may ask: How can we improve our study, research, and teaching? And also: How can we lend our strength to others who are also working for the general betterment of the profession?

Here are lines of thought to ponder:

We need a permanent national office with a full-time secretariat. Our organization is increasing in size and complexity. We can not taper off our services; we need to increase them. If we do not, we will seriously cramp our future growth.

We need to put annual dues on a more realistic scale. The decision at Chicago to increase dues by $1.00 may not exactly be applauded, but it should be approved.

We need to put our operations on a still broader base. We are now a kind of General Motors selling only Buicks and Oldsmobiles. We need to reach an even larger number of teachers. We should, for example, do additional publishing for elementary school teachers and for young researchers. Their problems are pressing, important, and easily overlooked.

We need also to make certain far-reaching, somewhat intangible moves. We should extend our working relationships with other professional and learned societies. Our consultations with the American Council on Education and with like groups have been mutually helpful and rewarding.

As individuals we need to affiliate with other organizations. Professor Brigance told us at Chicago that only about 900 of us are members of the American Association of University Professors. This organization speaks with a strong voice for the profession. If at times we disagree with its policies, we need all the more to lend our thought to its counsels.

Paying increased dues and supporting more organizations costs money. So for these and for more powerful reasons we need to get teachers' salaries increased. We should seek a larger share of the gross national product, which this year may touch 430 billions of dollars. We need to join with other groups to persuade the public that it should give a larger share of the GNP to the educating of boys and girls. Professor Harshbarger reminded us at Chicago that a vast difference exists between offering young people a degree and offering them an education: this last calls for genuine teachers, not roll-takers and examination scorers.

How would you like to cast your lot with a profession that will see the demand for its services doubled and tripled in the next ten to fifteen years? That is the outlook for teachers. Unless, however, we can meet this demand in a way that will utilize our best efforts, we should reach at once for the nearest hair shirt. We can meet the problems of the future by doing our individual tasks to the best of our ability, and by lending our continued and powerful support to the Speech Association of America.

*The President's Page is a new feature of* QJS. *It will be devoted in each issue to whatever the President of the SAA wishes to address to the membership. Loren D. Reid, Professor of Speech at the University of Missouri, is the retiring editor of Shop Talk, and our President for 1957.*

## JAMES ALBERT WINANS
### 1872—1956

Mr. Winans was one of the founders of the Speech Association, and its second President. He was one of the founders, too, of the Speech Association of the Eastern States. Brought up on a New York State hill farm in the shadow of the Catskills, he was graduated from Hamilton College in 1897, taught in high schools for two years, and came to Cornell as instructor in public speaking in 1899. In 1920 he transferred to Dartmouth College, retiring in 1942, but only to serve three more years at the University of Missouri. The last years of his long life he spent in Ithaca, the university town to which he had brought his bride when he first became a college teacher.

Though as department head he sponsored both dramatics and speech improvement, his own chief interest was always in public speaking, with a lesser interest in the oral interpretation of literature. In 1915, having earlier published a slim, trial volume of notes on the subject, he brought out the textbook, *Public Speaking*, which strongly influenced many college teachers. The originality of the book lay in its ingenious application of psychological theories of attention to the speaker's preparation and especially to delivery. It was later revised as *Speech Making*. Still later, with W. E. Utterback, he wrote on argument, and in the last year of his life brought out a study of Webster's part in the Knapp-White case, on which he and his Dartmouth colleague, the late Howard Bradley, had spent many years. His last work rounded a circle, for in 1915, in the first issue of *The Quarterly Journal*, he had written on the need for research, and at about the same time had initiated graduate studies at Cornell.

His friends remember gratefully not only his long years of service to the Association, but his simplicity and loyalty, quiet humor and genuine tolerance, superb courage in face of grave and threatening illness, and his complete integrity.

*—Herbert A. Wichelns*

## ALEXANDER M. DRUMMOND
### 1884—1956

Although he was not one of the founders, Alexander M. Drummond was active in the Speech Association almost from the beginning. He contributed to the third issue of its *Journal*. He was its president in 1920, and he was chairman of the committee whose report, *Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools*, published under his editorship with a series of related articles in 1925, did much to improve the teaching of speech in our high schools.

His two collections of speeches, *Persistent Questions in Public Discussion* with Everett Hunt (1924) and *Problems and Opinions* with Russell Wagner (1931), have served generations of students.

Drama was early a major interest. In 1909 he helped organize the Cornell Dramatic Club, and he was its director from 1912 to 1947. He conceived, set up, and ran the Little Country Theatre at the New York State Fair in Syracuse, 1919-1923. When the American Educational Theatre Association was organized in 1936, he became its vice-president. He was honorary president of the National Theatre Conference.

Alexander M. Drummond was born July 15, 1884 in Auburn, New York. He received his B.A. from Hamilton College in 1906 and his M.A. from Harvard University in 1907. The same year he joined the faculty of Cornell University, where he was head of the department from 1920 to 1940. Hamilton College conferred upon him the L.H.D. in 1938. He retired in June, 1952, and died November 29, 1956.

Boundless energy, an artist's imagination solidly anchored in a fund of shrewd common sense, and an interest in everything, but particularly in speech as the expression of thought and feeling—these were some of the qualities which made Alexander M. Drummond a great teacher, a frequently inspired and inspiring director, and a leader in his field for over forty years.

*—Barnard Hewitt*

# THE FORUM

With this issue *QJS* appears under a new cover, a new editor, and a new editorial board. These changes in ornamentation, however, are not intended to signal disturbing alterations in the scope and functions of the *Journal*. A new flavor will be detected, perhaps, in the pages of Shop Talk; and the selection and emphasis in the book reviews may call attention to new habits in the editor of that department. Both departments, however, as well as the rest of the *Journal*, will strive to respond for yet another three years to the best expectations of the multiplex and vigorous membership of the SAA.

Recently the editor was asked to prepare for *PMLA* a statement of the scope of *QJS*, to be published in September, 1957, along with comparable statements from the other journals subscribing to *The MLA Style Sheet*. The occasion provided by that statement and by the accession of a new editor seems appropriate for restating the special interests of *QJS*, substantially as they will be described in the compendium of *PMLA*. It is impossible to include in such a statement the most precise labels for each of the specialties comprehended within the SAA. We think, however, that the categories we have indicated will exclude nothing which ought to find place in our pages.

*Scope of QJS*

*The Quarterly Journal of Speech* is especially interested in short and medium-length (1500-5000 words) theoretical, historical, investigative, and critical articles in: (1) rhetoric and oratory, including written as well as oral public address, the rhetorical modes in literature, and semantics and associated disciplines; (2) theatre and drama; (3) language, voice, phonetics, and pronunciation; (4) the oral interpretation of literature; (5) speech science, speech pathology, and speech correction; (6) public speaking, discussion, and debate; (7) TV and radio. In each of these areas, of course, we welcome articles growing out of experimental studies.

Since the membership of the SAA includes classroom teachers in the schools, as well as college and university teachers, articles of broad, general significance for students and teachers of speech are welcomed. Articles of special or predominant concern to teachers in the high schools and lower schools belong more properly in *The Speech Teacher*. On the other hand, extended technical papers, special bibliographies, and reports and digests of highly specialized research and experimentation should be submitted first to *Speech Monographs*.

We welcome brief notes in the areas indicated for articles. They will usually be handled as "letters to the editor." We seek reviews (up to 600 words) of books closely relevant to the areas of the *Journal's* interest, and we seek to review or to notice all new books, including textbooks, within the academic fields of speech. We usually run a comprehensive review-essay in which many related books are considered together.

*Preparation of Manuscripts*

All contributors to the *QJS* are asked to accept *The MLA Style Sheet*

as their basic authority on the preparing of learned articles for publication; and also to accept *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language,* 2nd edition, unabridged, as basic authority for spelling and hyphenation. Copies of *The MLA Style Sheet* may be obtained from the Treasurer, Modern Language Association, 6 Washington Square North, New York 3, N. Y. The cost is 25 cents each copy.

Manuscripts for the *QJS* should be typewritten on standard-size paper with adequate margins at side, top, and bottom. Ribbon copies, not carbon or duplicated copies, should be submitted for consideration. Typescripts should be double-spaced, except that quotations of more than one or two sentences should be single-spaced without quotation marks.

Contributors are asked to devise brief titles for their articles; to center the title in capital letters on the first page of the manuscript, but not to underline it; to center their name in initial capitals below the title; and to place at the bottom of the first page a short statement identifying themselves. This statement should be underlined, except that titles of publications, if given in the statement, are not to be underlined.

**Footnotes should be numbered in sequence and typed on pages attached to the end of the article, each note to be double-spaced and to be separated from adjacent notes by triple spacing.**

The standard reference to a book includes the following elements in the following order: (1) the author's first, middle, and last name; (2) the title, underlined; (3) the edition cited if successive editions have appeared; (4) the place and date of publication, in parentheses; and (5) the page numbers of the passage cited or indicated. Thus:

Will Irwin, *Propaganda and the News* (New York, 1936), pp. 19-22.

B. L. Joseph, *Elizabethan Acting* (London, 1951), pp. 15-18.

Alan H. Monroe, *Principles and Types of Speech,* 3rd ed. (Chicago, 1949), pp. 80-81.

The standard reference to an article in a periodical includes as successive units: (1) the author's first, middle, and last name; (2) the title of the article enclosed in double quotation marks; (3) the title of the periodical underlined (or in many cases abbreviated and underlined); (4) the volume number in Roman numerals; (5) the year, sometimes preceded by the month, in parentheses; and (6) the page numbers in Arabic. Thus:

Margaret Mead, "Public Opinion Mechanisms among Primitive Peoples," *The Public Opinion Quarterly,* I (July, 1937), 5-7.

Don Geiger, "Oral Interpretation and the 'New Criticism,'" *QJS,* XXXVI (1950), 508-509.

The standard reference to multivolumed edited works includes successively the title, underlined, and the editor's first, middle, and last name, followed by place and date of publication in parentheses, by the volume number in Roman numerals, and by the page numbers in Arabic. Examples:

*The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln,* ed. Roy P. Basler (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1953), III, 522-550.

*Elizabethan Critical Essays,* ed. G. Gregory Smith (Oxford, 1904), II, 3-193.

For works cited as volumes in a continuing series, the author's name and the title of his work are first given; and these are followed by: (1) the title of the series with no underlining, (2) the serial number, if given, and (3) the place, date, and page references. Examples:

Harry Caplan, *Mediaeval "Artes Praedicandi": A Hand-List,* Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, XXIV (Ithaca, 1934), pp. 9-18.

*The Arcadian Rhetorike by Abraham*

*Fraunce*, ed. Ethel Seaton, Luttrell Society Reprints, IX (Oxford, 1950), pp. xv-xvi.

Careful attention to these directions and to the more detailed prescriptions in *The MLA Style Sheet* will gratify our editors, our printer, our authors, and in the long run, our readers.

D. C. B.

## ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING STANDARD PATTERNS OF SPEECH

*To the Editor:*

Between six and seven trillion words are uttered daily by about 160 million American people. The former figure is based on an estimate made in a recent program on linguistics given by Kemp Malone that the average American speaks around 40,000 words a day. We have a record of only a minute percentage of this; more is obviously impossible. It is doubtful if more than a fraction of the speakers of these billions of utterances turn to dictionaries for any guidance. In the practical affairs of the day-to-day world, people speak as their mothers taught them to speak.

In this country we are so concerned with literacy as a requirement of education that we tend to forget the great importance of the spoken word. Harold Anderson, in a recent address to the National Council of Teachers of English, told the story of an American teacher and a Hindu teacher talking over the problem of literacy in India. The American teacher had high hopes for mass reading. The Hindu teacher listened carefully and then, after agreeing with the American teacher that the Americans had much to teach, the Hindu replied, "We should welcome your help. Perhaps, however, we have something to offer in return. For while I regret the inability of my people to read and write, yet we must consider further the meaning of literacy. In the United States you measure literacy by the written word. In India we have a literacy of the spoken word—thoughtfully spoken and thoughtfully listened to."

This, perhaps, is as clear a statement of the subject matter of speech and possibly also of the subject matter of dictionaries as any I have ever encountered. We are concerned with the spoken word thoughtfully spoken and thoughtfully listened to. But we cannot hope to cover all possible utterances.

In order to obtain sound information with regard to speech, we must depend upon the observation of trained and scientific workers called phoneticians. Their observations deal with the speech of groups, individuals, or regions. For obvious reasons, in the making of good dictionaries, we take the agreed knowledge of the phoneticians as a basis of the record of pronunciation. For, after all, the function of reference books is to make the knowledge of specialists accessible to the general public—not every minute detail of knowledge in a particular field, but that part of it which a person outside the field may need to know or want to know at any given time.

There are two agreed general principles among all scientific workers in the field:

(1) Pronunciation keys should not be spelling keys—that is, they should represent actual pronunciation so far as this is possible; and

(2) The pronunciations recorded in a dictionary should be educated colloquial in context, and not pronunciations of isolated words or artificial "platform English." Above all, pronunciations in dictionaries should be contemporary and reputable.

I have been corresponding for some time with Mr. Ladislas Országh in Budapest with regard to the Hungarian-

English dictionary which he is making behind the Iron Curtain. (This correspondence, incidentally, has all had the approval of the State Department.) You may find interesting the statement he makes on pronunciation in his letter to me of March 5, 1951: "At the same time we are not harried by problems which face the compiler of every English dictionary: we have no need to indicate pronunciation, for our language is written with an orthography that is remarkably phonetic, just like Turkish or German or Finnish. In English-speaking countries people need dictionaries to tell them how a word is pronounced. Such problems do not exist here."

Not all languages are so irregular as to require pronunciation keys in dictionaries. For the pronunciation key is merely a device for giving regular and consistent directions to say the sounds of words. The letters of the alphabet are directions to say the sounds, but about 25 per cent of the time the English alphabet fails or misleads us in giving us directions on the pronunciations of words. There are, in English, over 230 spellings of approximately 40 different sounds. The first task of a dictionary from the standpoint of pronunciation, then, is to give clear directions to its users to say the proper sounds. The proper principles underlying a pronunciation key may, therefore, be said to call for (1) one symbol for each sound, and (2) the utilization (especially so in a school dictionary) of English speech habits, so as to produce a key that will be easy to use.

One of the important problems facing the speech teacher and the dictionary maker is to devise a system of pronunciation which will avoid over-stressing. According to Professor Cabell Greet, speech adviser for the Columbia Broadcasting System, one of his great difficulties is to get radio announcers to avoid over-stressing and artificially equalizing the pronunciation of English words. The International Phonetic Alphabet uses the symbol "schwa" for the unaccented vowel sound, and this symbol has now found its way into many, if not most, American dictionaries. Once this symbol is mastered, artificial distinctions made between the vowel sounds in unaccented syllables disappear and the pupil gets a natural iambic rhythm to his speech. However, this standard practice of using "schwa" is not everywhere understood and not everywhere accepted. Just the other day I received a query from a very sincere teacher with reference to "schwa." This letter reads as follows:

> Please explain the "inverted e" in phonetic spelling as an aid in the pronunciation of words. Please explain the tilde mark substitution by the dot above the e. I am meeting these for the first time in my classes in word study. I was surprised and alarmed because I wasn't aware of the change before this. Please help me all you can. I am very anxious to know what symbols for sounds I must understand so that I may be able to teach my group of pupils.

This teacher is simply unfamiliar with modern principles in linguistics and phonetics. Here we have a failure of the educational schools to take the knowledge in the field of phonetics and linguistics and make it a part of the teacher's daily life. I wrote to the teacher as follows:

> The "inverted e" or schwa, as it is technically called by many phoneticians, is the symbol used by the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) to indicate the neutral sound of a vowel in an unaccented syllable. As I point out in the preface of the *Thorndike-Barnhart High School Dictionary*, on page vii, schwa represents "the sound of *a* in about, *e* in taken, *i* in pencil, *o* in lemon, and *u* in circus. The use of only one symbol for this sound is the approved practice of modern phonetics and has proved a valuable aid to speakers, teachers, and beginners in the use of English." This one symbol enables us to replace as many as thirteen symbols nec-

essary in some other pronunciation keys and thereby reduces the teaching load.

You, as college teachers, have the clear duty to make sure that as many grade-school and high-school teachers as possible understand the scientific principles of language. And we, on our part, as reference-book makers, have a duty to reinforce your efforts and make this knowledge available to teachers.

In pronunciation, we try to give the pronunciations of hard words such as *arteriosclerosis, arsenical, arsenous,* and to indicate clearly the divided usage which is important nationally in such words as *ask, carburetor,* or *been.* We cannot indicate on a scientific basis the many, many varieties of pronunciations of a word. For example, Professor C. K. Thomas has found thirteen or more ways of pronouncing the word *oranges.* Even a pronouncing dictionary could not make a complete and accurate record of all the ways of pronouncing a particular word of this sort. We, therefore, try to present the important facts of pronunciation, especially such as are important nationally or from a contemporary point of view, or which indicate levels of usage. Of course, how many of our 160,000,000 citizens finally use this reference-book tool effectively is a matter of education, but this I am sure I can safely leave in your hands.

CLARENCE L. BARNHART
*Editor, The American College Dictionary*
*Bronxville, New York*

## REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the Speech Association of America (Magdalene Kramer, Loren Reid, and Karl Robinson elected by the members of the Association, H. P. Constans elected by the Administrative Council, and Frederick Haberman elected by the Legislative Assembly) submits the following nominations in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and By-Laws. The persons elected from this list will take office January 1, 1958.

### FOR SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT
**(One to be elected)**

Kenneth G. Hance, Michigan State U.
Orville A. Hitchcock, State U. of Iowa

### FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
**(Two to be elected)**

Elizabeth Carr, U. of Hawaii
Thorrell Fest, U. of Colorado
James Henning, U. of West Virginia
Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State U.

### FOR THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
MEMBERS AT LARGE

(Thirty to be elected for a three year term)

Martin P. Andersen, U. of California at Los Angeles
Paul R. Beall, Annapolis, Md.
Paul Boase, Oberlin Col.
Sam Boyd, Jr., West Virginia U.
J. Calvin Callaghan, Syracuse U.
Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State Col. for Women
Carl Dallinger, State U. of Iowa
Hugo David, Michigan State U.
H. Barrett Davis, Lehigh U.
Mrs. Louise Davison, Atlanta, Ga.
Milton Dobkin, Humboldt State Col.
Alice Donaldson, Clayton H. S., Clayton, Mo.
Randolph Edmonds, Florida A & M
Douglas Ehninger, U. of Florida
Carl D. England, Dartmouth Col.
Jean C. Ervin, Arlington, Va., Public Schools
Father J. Lawrence Flynn, Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio
Charles M. Getchell, U. of Mississippi
Edna Gilbert, Minot State Teachers Col.
Mrs. Doris Goodrich, Rochester Public Schools, Rochester, Minn.
L. Day Hanks, John Marshall H. S., Los Angeles, Calif.
Elbert Harrington, U. of South Dakota
Ray J. Harshfield, Eastern Montana Col. of Education
Lois S. Holladay, West Phoenix H. S., West Phoenix, Ariz.
Robert T. Holland, State U. of Iowa
Sara M. Ivey, U. of Arkansas
Charles A. Jones, State Col. of Washington
C. Robert Kase, U. of Delaware
Mary E. Latimer, Madison Col.

L. Poe Leggette, George Washington U.
Leroy Lewis, American Institute of Banking, New York, N. Y.
William J. Lewis, U. of Vermont
Charles Lindsley, Occidental Col.
Jane S. Ludgate, State Teachers Col., Edinboro, Pa.
Ralph McGinnis, Montana State U.
Virginia R. Miller, Wellesley Col.
Dorothy E. Miniace, U. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Wilbur E. Moore, Central Michigan Col.
Lawrence H. Mouat, San Jose State Col.
Ordean Ness, U. of Wisconsin
Mardel Ogilvie, Queens Col.
Florence Pass, Ensley H. S., Birmingham, Ala.
John Penn, U. of North Dakota
Hoyt Rawlings, Central H. S., West Allis, Wis.
Charles Redding, Purdue U.
Ross Scanlan, Col. of the City of New York
Leona Scott, Arkansas State Teachers Col.
Franklin R. Shirley, Wake Forest Col.
Anne Simley, Hamline U.
Ronald Sleeth, Garrett Biblical Inst.
Bess Sondel, U. of Chicago
C. Horton Talley, Southern Illinois U.
Don W. Terry, West Miami Jr. H. S., West Miami, Fla.
Howard Townsend, U. of Texas
Donald Veith, Chico State Col.
Lillian Vorhees, Fisk U.
Annetta L. Wood, Douglass Col., Rutgers U.
John Wilson, Cornell U.
Oretha Whitworth, Amarillo Sr. H. S., Amarillo, Texas
Leland Zimmerman, U. of Florida

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA MEMBERS

**Eastern Area: Three Year Term**
*(Four to be elected)*

Helen V. Cushman, Slippery Rock State Teachers Col.
Ruth Damon, Russell Sage Col.
Dorothy R. McConkey, Memorial Jr. H. S., Passaic, N. J.
Carol E. Prentiss, Stearns H. S., Millinocket, Me.
Vernon E. Rank, State Teachers Col., Oswego, N. Y.
Edward Shanken, U. of New Hampshire
Nadine Shepardson, Mount Holyoke Col.
Lloyd Welden, Sr., West Virginia U.

**Central Area: Three Year Term**
*(Four to be elected)*

John Black, Ohio State U.
Albert Croft, U. of Oklahoma
William M. Dawson, U. of Wisconsin H. S.
Alfred Edyvean, Butler U. Divinity School
Patricia McIlrath, U. of Kansas City
Clara Mawhinney, Bradley U.
Edgar E. Willis, U. of Michigan
Sister Annerose Wokurka, Cathedral H. S., St Cloud, Minn.

**Western Area: Three Year Term**
*(Four to be elected)*

Mrs. Sue W. Earnest, San Diego State Col.
John A. Grasham, Los Angeles City Col.
Theodore W. Hatlen, Santa Barbara Col.
Theodore Karl, Pacific Lutheran Col.
Elwood Kretsinger, U. of Oregon
Alonzo Morley, Brigham Young U.
Kathleen Pendergast, Seattle, Wash., Public Schools
Mrs. Rowena H. Roberts, Colorado Springs H. S., Colorado Springs, Colo.

**Southern Area: Three Year Term**
*(Four to be elected)*

Stanley Ainsworth, U. of Georgia
Glenn Capp, Baylor U.
Betty May Collins, Technical H. S., Memphis, Tenn.
William P. Dorné, Alabama Polytechnic Inst.
Hardy H. Perritt, U. of Alabama
Alma Sarett, U. of Florida
Claude Shaver, Louisiana State U.
Mrs. Helen M. Torrance, Robert E. Lee Jr. H. S., Orlando, Fla.

## PROVISIONS GOVERNING NOMINATION AND ELECTION

We reprint below provisions of the new Constitution and By-Laws of the Speech Association of America which are immediately relevant to the report of the Nominating Committee published on the preceding pages.

### From the Constitution

ARTICLE IX

The Legislative Assembly

Section 1. The Legislative Assembly shall be a representative body composed of the following members of the Speech Association of America: (1) ninety members elected at large, thirty each year for a term of three years; (2) forty-eight members elected from four geographical areas, on ballots cast by members of the Association resident in the respective areas, sixteen each year (four from each area) for a term of three years from candidates recom-

mended to the Nominating Committee by regional and state associations and/or other candidates proposed by the Nominating Committee; (3) a representative of each Interest Group; (4) the Presidents and Executive Secretaries or designated representatives of the following regional associations: the Speech Association of the Eastern States, the Central States Speech Association, the Southern Speech Association, the Western Speech Association, and the Pacific Speech Association; (5) one member chosen for a term of one year by each of the following national organizations: the American Speech and Hearing Association, the American Educational Theatre Association, the National Society for the Study of Communication, the American Forensic Association, and by other associations or federations that may hereafter be recognized by the Administrative Council and by the Legislative Assembly.

## From the By-Laws

### Article III

Section 3. The Nominating Committee shall propose at least two members of the Association for each office in which succession is not automatic, at least four members for the two places on the Administrative Council, at least sixty members for thirty delegates-at-large in the Legislative Assembly, and at least thirty-two members for the sixteen representatives of geographical areas in the Assembly.

Eight candidates shall be named from each of the four following geographical areas:

(1) the New England states, the Middle Atlantic states (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia), District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada;

(2) the Central states (Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma), and Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan in Canada;

(3) the Southern states (Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas), and the Canal Zone;

(4) the Western states (Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, California), the territories of Hawaii and Alaska, the Philippine Islands, and Alberta and British Columbia in Canada.

From these respective geographical areas the regional and state associations may recommend candidates to the Nominating Committee, nominations to be in the hands of the Chairman of the Committee not later than the first day of the annual meeting.

The Chairman of the Committee shall check with the Executive Secretary on the status of the membership of all nominees. The report of the Committee shall be published in the second issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and of *The Speech Teacher* following the election of the Committee.

Section 4. Any twenty-five members of the Association may make additional nominations by submitting them to the Executive Secretary not later than three months after the publication of the report of the Nominating Committee. These nominations shall be published in the next issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and of *The Speech Teacher*.

# NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT GUNDERSON, *Editor*

## ON THE FIRST FORTY YEARS OF THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, AND THE INDEX THEREOF

W. Norwood Brigance

Twenty years after it was begun, and fifteen years after it was first planned for publication, Giles Wilkeson Gray's *Index to the Quarterly Journal of Speech* has now been published.

In reviewing it I am brought to face with the words of the elder Oliver Wendell Holmes in *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table:* "Men, like peaches and pears, grow sweet a little while before they begin to decay. . . . Most writers, except sour and unsuccessful ones, get tired of finding fault at about the time they are beginning to grow old. As a general thing, I would not give a great deal for the fair words of a critic, if he is himself an author, over fifty years of age." You should be warned, therefore, that I own and have read every issue of the *Journal* covered by the *Index,* that I have been a member of the Speech Association of America for thirty-five of its forty-two years, and that a little while ago I reached Holmes's designated age of sweetness. I have no intention of writing a critical appraisal. The *Index* needs none. Rather I intend to survey the first forty years of the *Journal* as indexed in Gray's volume, to note some of the activities of the men who founded the Association, as they are recorded in print and now indexed, and to comment on outstanding articles, editorials, and Forum letters.

### I

The activities of those who founded the Association are not recorded in one department of the *Journal,* nor in one section of the *Index.* The first in point of time appears in J. M. O'Neill's quiet announcement in the first issue (1915, p. 51) that "The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking is at last a reality." Other records of activities are found in this first volume: the names of the first officers, committee members, charter members, and a statement of the aims and hopes (pp. 55-58). Significantly, in this first issue is an article by the Committee on Research (p. 24) presumbaly written by its chairman, Charles H. Woolbert, on plans for research; and in the same issue is James A. Winans' famous article on "The Need for Research" (p. 17), in which he said:

> I hold that by the scholarship which is the product of research the standing of our work in the academic world will be improved. . . . We have lacked scholarship. We complain of prejudice and unjust discrimination, and we have grounds; but we had best face the truth. In the long run men pass for what they are. . . . Our difficulty will be in getting into a sufficiently scientific frame of mind. Probably we shall do foolish things at first, as others have. . . . Will research in public speaking be permitted in universities? Research is not likely to be done for degrees and under encouraging

circumstances. Probably it will not be encouraged at first anywhere.

Altogether in the first two years appeared not less than seven articles and two editorials on research. These founders believed in research, not because it would lead to advanced degrees—for them it then would not—but because as Winans said, "it will be good for us, good for our work." Not until 1921 (p. 385) do we find the anouncement that the University of Wisconsin had become the pioneer in accepting candidates in speech for the Ph.D.

Through the early issues of the *Journal,* now easily located in the *Index,* can be found a discussion of the problems faced by early members. Woolbert (1916, p. 64) set forth pungently the reasons why departments of speech, lest they be smothered, needed to be separate from departments of English. Others wrote answers to the arguments of armchair academedians who would define speech out of existence by assigning its living parts to other departments, notably A. M. Drummond (1923, p. 135). There was also the problem, usually discussed in editorials (1923, p. 284), of institutions who hired coaches to win debates rather than scholars to teach, and of speech teachers who were "not reappointed" because they had "not brought enough debate and oratorical victories" to the institution. By 1932 the tension had been reduced enough that it was possible to write of it in good natured irony, as in the editorial on "Football and Forensics" (1932, p. 115). And if one wonders why the founders restricted membership to "academic teachers," the answer is suggested in O'Neill's "The True Story of $10,000 Fears" (1919, p. 128), which is a blow by blow account of resisting the efforts of one Dale Carnagey (later to be spelled Carnegie) to use the *Journal* for circulating a synthetic story of a fictitious man who overcame fears that were alleged to cost him $10,000 a year. The activities of the founders, as such, may be said to end with Winans' twentieth-anniversary speech at the 1935 convention (1936, p. 295). His words are as apt today as they were in 1935:

> We thank you for the privilege of this 'positively last appearance.' But, Ladies and Gentlemen, if all is peace, it is a novelty. This Association was born in rebellion, and it has been in a state of rebellion ever since. If there isn't a fight brewing around the corridors, it is strange, and maybe a pity. . . . [In the early days] it was 'Lay on, Macduff,' 'and so far into the night.' We did not go home sodden with listening; we went home to do some thinking. And so we grew in wisdom. It was a great 'share the wealth' movement.

Under the index entry, "Convention Attendance," is found the record of growth in attendance at conventions, and usually also a record of growth in membership of the Association (especially 1939, p. 320). In 1915 we had started with 119 members. By the end of the year membership had reached 160, and at the first convention "over sixty teachers were present" (1916, p. 87). By 1930 we had 1,530 members, and convention atendance had reached 508. Then Gail E. Densmore became Executive Secretary. Under his positive genius in public relations during the lean depression years—when the gross national product was tumbling from $104 billions to $56 billions, when unemployment stood at 14,000,000, and when other educational associations were losing members or barely holding even—our Association grew at an accelerated rate. At the end of Densmore's third term in 1939 the membership was roughly 4,500, and the convention attendance that year reached 1,001—not counting over 200 registered separately

with ASCA. The Association was now mature, big, and influential.

## II

Whoever is so brash as to name the all-time great articles in the *Journal,* as they are recalled to mind in scanning the *Index,* lays his professional standing on the line. Every man's list must be his own, and one man's meat is another man's poison. For me, the following are the all-time great articles published during the first twenty years of the *Journal,* that is, during the first half of the period covered by the *Index,* with Winans' article of 1936 being included because it deals with problems and events of the first twenty years. Some of these articles are listed because they still sparkle and stimulate, some because they contain an enduring body of knowledge, and some because they record history that shaped the future as told by those who could say, "All of this I saw, and a part of this I was." Each of these articles can be read with profit by younger members of the Association. Each is a part of our professional heritage:

Charles Henry Woolbert: Five articles on the psychology of persuasion: 1917, p. 249; 1918, p. 19; 1919, pp. 12, 101, and 212.

Bromley Smith: Early rhetoricians made human and real: Protagoras, 1918, p. 196; Prodicus, 1920(2), p. 51; Corax, 1921, p. 13; Gorgias, 1921, p. 335; Hippias, 1926(3), p. 129; Theodorus, 1928, p. 71.

George Pierce Baker, "The 47 Workshop," 1919, p. 185.

Everett Lee Hunt, "Plato on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," 1920(3), p. 33.

Paul Shorey, "What Teachers of Speech May Learn from the Theory and Practice of the Greeks," 1922, p. 105.

Ralph Dennis, "One Imperative Plus," 1922, p. 218.

Hoyt H. Hudson, "The Field of Rhetoric," 1923, p. 167; "The Tradition of Our Subject," 1931, p. 320.

Gladys Murphy Graham, "Logic and Argumentation," 1924, p. 350, and its companion article, "The Natural Procedure Argument," 1925, p. 319.

Thomas C. Trueblood, "A Chapter on the Organization of College Courses in Public Speaking," 1926, p. 1.

J. M. O'Neill, "After Thirteen Years," 1928, p. 242.

James A. Winans, "Of Conventions," 1936, p. 295.

## III

Almost two pages in the *Index* are required to list the 203 editorials that have appeared in the *Journal,* and seven pages are required to list the letters and other items that have been published in the Forum. But the largest single item is Book Reviews. To list the imposing number of books reviewed over the forty years required 160 pages, and Gray properly has placed them in a separate section. The most diligent reviewers, one notes in perusing this section of the index, are Barnard Hewitt (81 books reviewed), C. K. Thomas (73), E. L. Hunt (69), Hoyt H. Hudson (57), and Donald C. Bryant (46).

Altogether the *Index* contains nearly 21,000 entries. Each item is cross-listed under the author, under each significant word in the title, and under its appropriate subject matter—in the attempt to enable the user to find the material under any given word he would be likely to use. Thus Loren D. Reid's article, "Did Charles Fox Prepare His Speeches?" is listed at least four times: under "Reid," "Did," "Fox," and "Speeches." Items in the Forum are likewise cross-listed. For example, Cabel Greet's For-

um letter in "Reply to Professor Zandvoort," is listed at least three times: under "Greet," "Reply," and "Forum: Greet."

Readers of the *Journal* will find the *Index* an invaluable reference. Members of the Association will note with pride that it was "prepared under the auspices of the Speech Association of America." All who consult back issues will remain indebted to the compiler for his twenty years' labor of love.

This is a fitting place to call attention also to other indexes and bibliographies published by the Speech Association of America, of which Gray's is the latest:

1. Franklin H. Knower, *Table of Contents of The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Speech Monographs, and The Speech Teacher, with a Revised Index Compiled through 1952.* Its Table of Contents is a standard ready reference, and its compact Index has not been outdated by Gray's volume.
2. Franklin H. Knower, *Graduate Theses—An Index of Graduate Work in Speech,* published annually in *Speech Monographs* since 1935, and indexing graduate work since 1902.
3. Clyde W. Dow, *Abstracts of Theses in the Field of Speech,* published annually in *Speech Monographs* since 1946.
4. J. Jeffery Auer, *Doctoral Dissertations in Speech: Work in Progress,* published annually in *Speech Monographs* since 1952.
5. Frederick W. Haberman, *A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address,* published annually in *QJS* and *Speech Monographs* since 1951 and containing bibliographies since 1950.
6. John H. McDowell, *Bibliography on Theatre and Drama in American Colleges and Universities, 1937-1947,* published in *Speech Monographs,* XVI, No. 3, November, 1949.

Some twenty-five years ago Elizabeth D. McDowell lamented, "Other educators say we have no 'literature.' We really do have, but we have no indexes or bibliographies for making our publications known to others." After many years we have the bibliographies and indexes.

BOOK REVIEWED

*Index to the Quarterly Journal of Speech, Volumes I to XL, 1915-1954.* Prepared under the auspices of the Speech Association of America. Compiled by Giles Wilkeson Gray. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1956; pp. ix+338. $5.00.

---

GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS & THE GENTEEL TRADITION. By Gordon Milne. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956; pp. x+294. $6.00.

At last we have an up-to-date, impartial, thoroughly documented biography of George William Curtis. Curtis is not a Titanic figure in America's past, yet no careful history of literary criticism, public address, or political reform in America can safely disregard him. Nonetheless, Edward Carey's *George William Curtis,* published in 1894, was the latest book-length study available in English prior to publication of Professor Milne's volume.

Milne's literary biography is the outgrowth of a doctoral study, and sometimes conspicuous critical categories and a tendency, especially in nonliterary matters, to allege causality where only coincidence has been established remind one of the book's derivation. But these are small matters beside the facts that Mr. Milne gives a balanced, modern appraisal of the man and appends to it the fullest bibliography yet offered to those seriously interested in Curtis' life and influence. Reasonable men may debate some of the critical judgments contained in the volume, but all must thank the author for performing a needed scholarly service in workmanlike fashion.

Although he has explored a vast number of private papers and other sources, Milne has not revised significantly either the biographical narrative or the personal image recorded in books and sketches written by Curtis' friends soon after his death. Differences of view between nineteenth-century and twentieth-century biographers are largely confined to their appraisals of Curtis' influence and ultimate place in history.

That Curtis "possessed the essentials which distinguished the Genteel Tradition at its best," is the central thought of Milne's biography. It seems to me a sound case is made for saying neither more nor less than this in final judgment. Curtis wrote travel books which were at least as good as those by his contemporaries. He was never entirely successful as a satirist or

novelist; still, one must compare him with Thackeray or Mark Twain, with Dickens or Henry James, to discover just what the veins he tried really could produce in his time. He was, thinks Milne, at his best in the personal essay where, although "one cannot claim that Curtis was another Addison or Lamb or Irving," yet "he follows not too far behind his models, and his essays, like theirs, still appeal." As a literary critic Curtis was often superficial and he sometimes mistook nobility of aim for artistic excellence; nevertheless, he was remarkably successful in recognizing "what was best in the literature of the past, and—a more difficult task—in his own day." In sum, only the very best writers of his day outdid him, and none was more versatile.

Since very few literary critics after Julius Caesar Scaliger have understood why and how a speech must differ from an essay, it is no surprise that the least competent sections of this literary biography are the evaluations of Curtis as a speaker. "By no means," wrote Scaliger in his *Poetics*, "are we to accept the popular idea that eloquent speaking rather than persuasion is the end of oratory." Milne, like Curtis himself, accepts the "popular idea" without realizing it. Though he furnishes the best catalogue of Curtis' Lyceum lectures yet published and supplies an adequate account of his political and occasional speaking, only style, thought sequence, and delivery are examined—and these very generally—when the author undertakes to appraise the speeches. No attention is paid here to rhetorical invention, the discovery of available proofs appropriate to the given occasion. The consequence is that Milne fails to see how Curtis drifted always toward the epideictic oration in speaking as he drifted always toward the personal essay in writing. Mr. Milne does not consider that the genres of oratory, like the genres of written expression, impose different demands on the aspiring artist; thus, he fails to see that Curtis had no more success in deliberative speaking than in writing novels and possessed no more real talent for forensic oratory than for writing poetry. As an orator Curtis was the speaking voice of the Genteel Tradition, but his latest biographer has not discovered why he was no more than this.

Despite these criticisms, it is worth repeating that this is a study such as we have needed, lest we forget there *was* a worthy Genteel Tradition in our literature and that George Curtis represented, in a wider variety of popular arts than any other figure, its best features and its inescapable limitations.

CARROLL C. ARNOLD,
*Cornell University*

THE ORIGINS AND PREHISTORY OF LANGUAGE. By G. Révész. Translated from the German by J. Butler. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956; pp. viii+240. $7.50.

"We are never content with knowledge of things as they exist; we want to know how they have come about. . . . This quest for origins is deeply rooted in man's striving for understanding." Upon the basis of this philosophy, and rejecting the time-honored dictum that speculations regarding the origins of speech have long ago passed the point of vanishing returns, the professor of psychology at the University of Amsterdam has presented one more theory of those origins, which he designates as the "contact" theory. The book first appeared in 1946 as *Ursprung und Vorgeschichte der Sprache*, as a development of three earlier publications between 1941 and 1945.

After a brief Introduction in which the author seeks to justify his undertaking and to outline his development, he proceeds through twelve chapters to lay the foundations and to develop his theory. In the process three principal phases seem to emerge: first, the criticisms of previous theories; second, the "Theory of Linguistic Functions"; and third, the "contact" theory of the origin of language.

The penetrating critiques of older theories are based largely on the problem of methodology. One is disturbed, however, by the feeling that unbridged gaps are left in the arguments, that there is a presumption, an implication perhaps more by omission than by explication, that the beginnings of speech awaited the emergence of the human race rather than developing along with man's emergence. Except for this slight uncertainty the evaluations are well developed and sound.

The "contact" theory, to which the rest of the book is an approach, resembles very closely that of de Laguna. Language is based, he argues, on the need to establish contact, rapport, with others. Spatial contact is not enough; the desire for emotional contact is above the instinctive; but even beyond that is a striving for intellectual contact, which presupposes language. "Just as emotional contact stimulates an emotional echo, so intellectual contact gives rise to a link of an intellectual nature."

The first form of utterance is the purely expressive cry, which is entirely noncommunica-

tive. Communication begins with the vague, unspecified yet directed *cry*, proceeds through the more individually addressed *call*, to the *word*. Language itself is derived directly from the call. The advance through the first three steps, from expressive vocalization to the addressed call, is clearly traced; but how the transition is made from the call to the word is, according to the author, unknown: "we are unable to form an adequate conception of how the addressed calls were transformed into words, of how what was at first fluid became fixed. It is a question which cannot be answered without using hypotheses based purely on imagination and without any sort of empirical basis." After such an admission one wonders how much closer we are to answering the question as to the origin of language.

Both de Laguna's theory and that of Professor Révész are evolutionary in their essential foundations. Both begin with the cry and advance to the word, through much the same processes of development. Both postulate the three basic functions of language, the imperative, the indicative, and the interrogative. The intermediate stage of the "addressed call" is not found in the theory of de Laguna, who apparently does not differentiate between the cry and the call. Professor Révész admits his inability to explain the final steps, in which the addressed call becomes the word; de Laguna at least makes the attempt. While there are some gaps left in the theory as presented by the former, on the whole it seems somewhat more incisive, more lucid in its exposition than that presented by the latter.

The section of the book which attracted me most, however, was not the development of the theory of origins, but the "Theory of Linguistic Functions." Language is approached from two points of view, that of purpose and that of means. Five purposes are subsumed, "the establishment of mental contact," the facilitation and creation of thought, the formation, modification and supplementing of external perceptions, the development of self-consciousness or self-awareness, and finally, as a medium of self-expression. These purposes are achieved by means of the symbolic nature of language, regarded by many as "*the* essence of language." The functions of language, differentiated from the purposes and the means, are embodied in the indicative and the imperative modes, to which is added later the interrogative. These are not grammatical categories, but psychological. Upon these three functions, as they meet the criteria previously established, rests the entire structure of language.

The "Theory of Linguistic Functions" could stand alone; it would be worth reading by itself. But it is made the foundation for the "contact" theory of the origins of language, which of course must in turn meet the demands of a basic formulation of a theory of what language is all about.

There are other sections of the book which will also be found provocative, such as Chapter VII, "Human and Animal Forms of Contact," and Chapter X, "The Logical Structure of the Contact Theory." Especially interesting is the altogether too short suggestion of silence as "a speechless form of speech activity." "The problem of silence has a place among the theoretical problems of speech. . . . Only a creature capable of speech can be silent. We only learn to be silent in the course of life after having learnt to speak." One is reminded of the old German *Sprichwort*, *"Sprechen ist silbern, Schweigen ist golden."*

The presentation under discussion is stimulating, penetrating, provocative. It will be read with keen interest by linguists, psychologists, and psycholinguists. It should also be read by students interested in general speech theory. The author has succeeded, in my opinion, in his main effort, which was "to bring back into present consciousness the age-old problem of linguistic origins and beginnings, which exists consciously or unconsciously for every epoch."

GILES WILKESON GRAY,
*Louisiana State University*

MEANING AND NECESSITY. By Rudolf Carnap. Second Edition, Enlarged. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956; pp. x+258. $5.00.

*Meaning and Necessity* was first published in 1947. Its author, a member of the Viennese circle of empiricists, had as his purpose at that time the development of a method for the semantical analysis of meaning, that is, a new method for analyzing and describing meanings of linguistic expressions.

Inheriting a tradition of anti-metaphysical thought, and influenced by researches of Russell and others in logic and the foundations of mathematics, Carnap and others of his circle have as their goal, unified science. Such a goal has inspired the search for a neutral system of symbols, free from the dross of historical languages.

Carnap does not doubt that the pragmatical investigation of languages is of greatest importance for an understanding both of the behavior of individuals and of the character and

development of whole cultures. Nevertheless, he suggests that for the special purpose of the development of logic, the construction and semantical investigation of language systems are more important. He recommends that in order to see correctly the functions of formally constructed languages, one must abandon the old prejudices that a predicator must stand either for a class or for a property but not for both, and that an individual expression must stand either for an individual or for an individual concept but not for both. To understand how language works, Carnap suggests that one must realize that every designator has both an *intension* and an *extension*.

Carnap's object has been not so much to carry out exact analyses of exactly constructed language systems as to state some considerations aimed at the discovery of concepts and methods suitable for semantical analysis. Much of the first part of his book is devoted to an exposition of the method of extension and intension as it applies to predicators and sentences.

After the discussion of meaning, the main topic is modal logic, that is, the theory of modalities such as necessity, possibility, impossibility. Carnap correlates modalities with corresponding semantical concepts, believing that clarification can best be achieved in this way.

Although the main body of the first edition is unchanged, Carnap has appended a fifty-page supplement to the revised edition. When E. A. Nagel and others reviewed the book in its first edition, they took exception to some of Carnap's claims for the simplicity and the scientific purity of his system. The supplement contains five articles previously published as rejoinders to questions raised by critics and colleagues. These articles represent further explanations, modifications, and extensions of the author's views. The first and most extensive of the supplementary articles deals with the problem of abstract entities. Carnap argues that no ontological commitment of any sort is made when one adopts a language which appears to mention such abstract entities as proposition, truth, classes, properties, etc. He views language construction as essentially an exercise in engineering; consequently, he believes that one primary concern is with the utility of the linguistic instrument for the performance of scientific tasks. The decision to use terms referring to abstract entities is a *practical* one, not a philosophical one.

In the last of the articles in the supplement, Carnap calls attention to the urgent need for a system of theoretical pragmatics, not only for psychology and linguistics, but also for analytic philosophy. "Since pure semantics is sufficiently developed," he observes, "the time seems ripe for attempts at constructing tentative outlines for pragmatical systems. Such outline may first be restricted to small groups of concepts (e.g., those of beliefs, assertions, and utterances); it may then be developed to include all those concepts needed for discussions in the theory of knowledge and the methodology of science."

MARIE HOCHMUTH,
*University of Illinois*

HARLEY GRANVILLE BARKER: MAN OF THE THEATRE, DRAMATIST AND SCHOLAR. By C. R. Purdom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; pp. xiv+322. $6.00.

There must be many scholars of the theatre who like myself have felt strongly the need of a volume summing up the work of Harley Granville Barker. I confess to wishing at times for the knowledge and the nerve to tackle the job myself, and to a feeling of relief and satisfaction when I knew that C. R. Purdom was both to write a book on the man and to edit the Shaw-Barker correspondence. Purdom has been known for years as a practitioner in the theatre, a knowledgeable journalistic critic of drama and theatre, an editor of Shakespeare, a writer of books on practical production. The Barker biography and commentary seemed in safe hands.

This book must become a standard reference work for all interested in twentieth-century drama and theatre. It must have been a very difficult book to write. I would I could assess the writing of it as highly as one must treasure the material it contains. But I fear the decision to give a separate volume to Shaw's letters to Barker doomed the work at the start to a disturbing incompleteness. The paragraph of quasi-apology which heads the Acknowledgments (p. ix) is cold comfort for the reader unable to turn to Shaw's obvious copious correspondence (still unpublished) with the brilliant young Barker whom he adopted to all intents and purposes as his dramatic and theatric heir. The absence of the letters referred to throughout is more than tantalizing, it is damnably discouraging, and the few actual quotations but increase the reader's sense of frustration. The problem of organization (the book is divided into four parts: Actor, Producer, The Visit to America and the First World War, Writer) does not somehow seem solved. Barker's varied interests and actual work refuse to

be so neatly compartmented, and the third division, even if obviously so made by one personally embarrassed by knowing the three persons most involved, is a weak and most inadequate way of dismissing Barker's marital problems. Its very title is too vague and euphemistic. Possibly Shaw was the only man who *could* have handled with understanding, sympathy, and tolerance the marriage and divorce of Barker and Lillah McCarthy; it is even possible he could have explained Barker's second marriage. He alone, I feel, could have written without acrimony or over-delicacy of the shattering effects upon Barker and his career of Helen Huntington's admitted aversion to himself and to all persons and things of the theatre. It is conceivable that Purdom is right in his claim that Barker himself was doomed to failure, but the many problems (personal, psychological, aesthetic, practical) crying aloud for full, free, and fructifying discussion, analysis, and judgment, are not here resolved. The Shaw shadow looms too large and too omnipresently not to be materialized; the material in each section is too arbitrarily arranged and too generally overlaps into the others; the writing itself is most uneven; certain sentences positively defy understanding; the structure, large and small, is somewhat more than cavalier.

Nevertheless, this is an important book. I am sure all the relevant and highly significant factual material is here. The correspondence with others than Shaw, notably with Gilbert Murray and with Barrie, adds greatly to the value of the volume.

Am I over-captious and seemingly most ungrateful to a critic who faced insuperable problems of tact and taste, of tactics and strategy, of wedding straightforward biography to penetrating and revealing creative criticism? I fear so. I realize Shaw never could have brought himself, even had time admitted, to the task of explaining the elusive and enigmatic man whom he loved so dearly; although he himself was too unconceited to put it this way, even a younger Shaw would have been wasting his powers in the writing of mere biography. So let us be content—the facts are here. The haunting enigma of the haunted "Man of the Theatre, Dramatist and Scholar" whom Purdom in his Epilogue, the best-written part of his book, sees as a tragic figure, remains. I know not the living man of the theatre or scholar who could give us a satisfying "full length portrait" of Barker. Personally unsatisfied with the evaluation here, I still trust the fascination of the figure, tragic or no, does not too soon tempt others no more clairvoyantly gifted and far less adequately equipped with the necessary documentation than Purdom to attempt a new assessment. Let this volume suffice.

E. J. West,
*University of Colorado*

LA FOLLETTE AND THE RISE OF THE PROGRESSIVES IN WISCONSIN. By Robert S. Maxwell. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1956; pp. xii+271. $4.50.

For present-day Americans the term "progressive" in a political sense has largely lapsed into "innocuous desuetude" or is associated with Henry Wallace's abortive presidential campaign of 1948. Today "liberal" is a much more common term, or, in the Democratic Party, "New Deal." For the robust days of the insurgent or progressive movement within the Republican Party of the early decades of this century, one must go to the history books.

A stimulating new study of what was probably the most significant sector of the progressive battle line is furnished in this publication of the State Historical Society of Wisonsin. Ten years ago the same publishers issued the provocative *Theodore Roosevelt and the Progressive Movement* by George E. Mowry, concerned particularly with T. R. and the fortunes of his personal Progressive Party of 1912. Maxwell's book glances briefly, in a late chapter, at this episode and at La Follette's role therein but concerns itself chiefly with the state of Wisconsin from 1900 to 1914, as principles and programs championed by the progressive wing of the Republican Party were put into force and as their influence was widely felt in other states.

Today the direct primary, strict public utility regulation, the use of university-trained experts in government are so commonplace that we take them for granted. It is good for us to be reminded that these and other aids to scientific, democratic service of the people did not come without real effort and often came against great inertia and organized, stubborn opposition.

Nowhere was the fight hotter than in Wisconsin. The author skillfully sketches the social, economic, and political milieu in which the struggle took place. The entire book maintains the dual emphasis of its title: the progressives and La Follette. With so colorful a leader as "Battling Bob," it is difficult to avoid letting him dominate the story. Mr. Maxwell accurately portrays him and his dynamic lead-

ership, but in presenting the progressive movement he keeps broad principles uppermost, carrying the movement on through numerous significant legislative and administrative accomlishments for a decade after La Follette was elected to the United States Senate, giving credit to numerous other progressives, and making clear their contributions. In final appraisal, however, he comes back to "Old Bob," whose ideals and prejudices, powers and weaknesses, triumphs and failures "were reflected in the progressive movement in Wisconsin."

Students of the "Wisconsin Idea" will find the last chapter, entitled "The Balance Sheet," an interesting account of the weaknesses and merits of the progressive regime. On the whole, Maxwell finds the balance definitely in the black.

For those of us who are something less than admirers of the present junior senator from Wisconsin and are inclined to repeat the ancient lines, "Alas, from what high hopes to what relapse unlooked for we are fallen," the author suggests that the initial large dose of progressive medicine may have unsettled the patient's stomach, with resultant periodic upsets in a cycle of progressive-then-conservative control.

CARROLL P. LAHMAN,
*Pasadena College*

DAVID CROCKETT: THE MAN AND THE LEGEND. By James Atkins Shackford. Edited by John B. Shackford. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1956; pp. xiv+338. $6.00.

The legend of Davy Crockett has astonishing vitality. Any boy of ten can tell of the man who was reared on whiskey, rattlesnake eggs, bear meat, and mustard, who "kilt him a bar when he was three," and "Fought single-handed through the Injin War, Till the Creeks were whipped and the peace in store." Professor Shackford cheerfully relinquishes this Davy to the folklorist and attempts to restore "the Crockett God made," lost in the mazes of myth and journalistic fancy. No disrespect either to him or the Deity is intended by the observation that the mythological Crockett is more attractive than the real one.

By sifting the court records of fifteen counties, the archives of Tennessee, and many other sources, Professor Shackford compiled a factual record that will probably remain definitive. It is a great pity that illness prevented him from revising the manuscript. Had this misfortune not occurred, the book might have had more sustained narrative interest and attracted readers outside the ranks of the historians to whom it will be largely restricted in its present form.

While retrieving the real from the mythical Crockett, Shackford tries also to modify the historical judgment that dismisses him as a political hack, vain, stupid, and corrupt. Unfortunately, the evidence at best shows that he was more fool than knave. Elected as a Jacksonian to the House in 1827, he turned against his party before the end of the first session of his first term. The Whigs cynically adopted him, writing books for him and about him, putting speeches in his mouth, and puffing him in their papers. To underpin their flattery, the United States Bank lent him money, which benevolent Nicholas Biddle wrote off the books when repayment was inconvenient.

The defense consists of two arguments. (1) David consistently stood for his Tennessee Vacant Land Bill, designed to help the West Tennessee settlers to secure valid titles to their farms at minimum cost, and broke with his party only when he despaired of gaining his ends through it. (2) Like the hero in a Greek tragedy, he was doomed by one fatal flaw, a hatred for Jackson that passed the border of sanity. This is a two-edged defense indeed. If we concede that principle dictated Crockett's revolt, we must marvel at a mind that could imagine the Whigs would pass better land legislation for West Tennessee than the Democrats would. The second item of the defense we must accept in part, but Professor Shackford's own account makes it impossible to regard the anti-Jackson obsession as the one weakness of an otherwise noble character.

To Crockett might be applied the verdict on Charles II: nothing so became his life as his manner of leaving it. Had he not died heroically at the Alamo, boys today would not be singing songs about him and wearing coonskin caps. Ironically, he was there not as a fighter for freedom, but as a politician hoping to rehabilitate his fortunes in a land sure to become a part of the United States. He joined the insubordinate commanders at the Alamo, who had defied Sam Houston's orders to clear out of the place, because Houston was a Jacksonian!

Perhaps there is more to be said in favor of Professor Shackford's theory of a "fatal flaw" than has been indicated in this review!

NORMAN W. MATTIS,
*University of North Carolina*

THE LEGACY OF HOLMES AND BRANDEIS: A STUDY IN THE INFLUENCE OF IDEAS. By Samuel J. Konefsky. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956; pp. 316. $6.00.

Students of American jurisprudence frequently have sought to trace the growth of the basic concepts underlying the Constitution, and to show how individual philosophies have dominated those who have served as judicial interpreters from the bench of the United States Supreme Court. Professor Konefsky, of the Brooklyn College Department of Political Science, has analyzed, in an incisive and scholarly work, the important influence of two of the best known Justices.

The author develops the theme stated in his subtitle: "A Study of the Influence of Ideas," carefully comparing the concepts that dominated Holmes and Brandeis, sketching their origins, and tracing their influence upon the judicial process. In his analysis, he demonstrates his own broad grasp of the world of constitutional law, and more particularly his keen insight into the lives and minds of these two giants of the judiciary.

Konefsky's "systematic study of the exact nature of the intellectual heritage" of the "Holmes-Brandeis tradition" is perhaps best illustrated in his exploration of the differences between the two jurists. Holmes was the legal philosopher searching for the first principles of law. Brandeis was the legal economist searching for a rational undergirding for progressive experimentation. However, to take a specific point of agreement, each attempted to limit the jurisdiction of the Court. Yet Holmes followed this line because of his belief in the inherent freedom of the legislative process, while Brandeis, on the other hand, so held because he believed that by limiting jurisdiction the justices could play "a creative role . . . in molding constitutional law to meet the needs of social change—in essence a responsibility of statesmanship."

Professor Konefsky very skillfully traces the influences which brought two men of differing backgrounds and philosophies by such diverse paths to similar conclusions. Perhaps this is his unique contribution. He shows that each man was keenly conscious of the influence of the "ideas" of the Supreme Sourt on the ultimate destiny of an evolving society. The legacy of "the Holmesian gospel of judicial forbearance," and the Brandeis concept of "the fusion of richly informed judgment and high social purpose" combined to provide principles by which judicial review keeps pace with changing times.

Students of rhetorical theory will find three facets of this study of special significance:

First, Brandeis' chief contribution to appellate practice as accepted by the Supreme Court in *Muller v. Oregon*. Prior to 1908 the Court in its reviews took cognizance of only three kinds of material upon which to reach a decision: (1) the Constitution; (2) previous decisions of the Court; (3) the record of the case. As attorney for the State of Oregon in the *Muller* case, Brandeis successfully argued that regardless of the traits and quirks of judicial logic by which a case came before the Court, the Justices could not be blind to well-known truths. In this instance, after submitting only two pages of logical analysis from these accepted sources, Brandeis took eighty-eight pages to ask that the Court take judicial notice of certain "facts of life" about the position of women in industry, facts not previously appearing in the record which should, nevertheless, be considered in reaching a decision. From that time forward, attorneys have been free to call attention to such facts in their appeals, a practice which the teacher of public speaking trained in the Aristotelian tradition would have encouraged long since.

Second, the importance of the Court as a forum for the presentation of the major doctrines in a democratic society. Those who hold that the highest function of the orator is to determine the direction of the main currents of thought will find much indirect support in these pages.

Third, the influential educational function of opinions and dissents—addresses from the bench, whether presented orally or not. The products of Holmes' mind illustrate this principle, as does Brandeis' desire to make the Court a teacher. Holmes was a judge most of his active life, giving relatively few addresses to other audiences. Yet his pronouncements from the courts of Massachusetts and from the highest tribunal over almost half a century constitute a distinguished corpus of deliberative speaking.

J. Garber Drushal,
*College of Wooster*

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF PETER CARTWRIGHT. Introduction, Bibliography, and Index by Charles L. Wallis. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956; pp. 349. $3.75.

The publishers are to be congratulated on making this frontier classic more readily available. A highly valuable source, first published

in 1856, it adds much to our understanding of political, social, and religious conditions during the first half of the nineteenth century.

For sheer entertainment it is hard to surpass the Cartwright *Autobiography*. Although the celebrated circuit rider's pugilistic encounters have been exaggerated, he was a heavy-fisted, keen-witted, sharp-tongued exponent of muscular Christianity. The *Autobiography* abounds in racy accounts of his successful bouts with the "rowdies," his victorious assault on all rival denominations, his contempt for "hot house preachers" (i.e., graduates of theological schools), and his perceptive judgment of slaveholder and abolitionist. Students of rhetoric will enjoy the persuasive techniques for exhorting the faithful, convicting the sinner, and confounding theological antagonists. Throughout, Cartwright offers advice on sermon content and delivery, sometimes as singular as his prescription for preserving the vocal instrument—"a little cayenne pepper and table salt dissolved in cold vinegar."

The centennial edition of the *Autobiography* is in another sense a keen disappointment. Though it contains a short Introduction, a useful Index, and Bibliography, careful footnoting could have added immeasurably to the book's value. Those characters and events, which today are meaningless names, deserve a more lively resurrection. Moreover, illustrations and maps would have increased the interestingness of the volume; even the old circuit rider's portrait, used as frontispiece in the original edition, is omitted. For these additions we shall have to await a definitive biography.

PAUL H. BOASE,
*Oberlin College*

THE ART OF GREEK COMEDY. By Katherine Lever. London: Methuen and Company, 1956; pp. x+212. 21s.

Only during the last forty years has the bastard of classical culture, Greek comedy, been given its rightful place in the family of drama. To the growing list of works which help to legitimize this rogue ditch-delivered by Dionysos—works by Legrand, Körte, Norwood, Webster, and Pickard-Cambridge—we can now add a handsome and well-written book by Professor Katherine Lever. At first glance, her *Art of Greek Comedy* might seem to be offering the same kind of critical history that Norwood offers in his *Greek Comedy*. But her work is not so much a rival of Norwood's as a complement to it. Norwood gives a history in which he analyzes fully the development of individual dramatists. Miss Lever focuses on the growth and function of comic techniques.

She organizes her book both topically and chronologically. The three opening chapters deal with comedy before Aristophanes; the next three, with different aspects of Aristophanes; the two final chapters, with Middle and New Comedy. The chapters on Aristophanes are the best in the book because they stick most closely to the art of comedy. In them she analyzes—and often most perceptively—the comic techniques of some of the world's greatest plays. The chapter on Middle Comedy is the weakest because so little can reliably be said about the artistry of its fragments that comments almost perforce have to fall back on the mere subject matter of the plays.

Much of the book describes the complex historical, intellectual, and social context in which dramatic art develops. When Miss Lever attempts to justify her unusual emphasis on this context (see pp. 81 and 192), she does not argue at all persuasively. Happily, her practice is better than her theory. In passage after passage she reveals how helpful a knowledge of contemporary history, philosophy, and lyric poetry can be to an understanding of the plays.

Two faults mar even the best chapters. One of them follows from the very nature of her interest: not once does she analyze concretely and structurally a complete Greek play. This sacrifice of the artistic integrity of a play is puzzling in a book that claims to deal with artistic effect. The second fault is even more puzzling: for a work purporting to deal with comedy remarkably little is said about humor, as Miss Lever herself admits (p. 130). To say, as she does, that the flavor of a comic scene is lost when its humor is laboriously explained is, alas, often true, but not to try to explain is to burke a central critical problem.

Still, even with these faults, Miss Lever's book is so thoroughly documented, so helpful in relating Aristophanic and New Comedy to their philosophical climates, and so reliable in its analysis of techniques that it will long serve as a standard critical work for anyone interested in Greek comedy.

EDWARD B. PARTRIDGE,
*Cornell University*

SHAKESPEARE SURVEY 9. Edited by Allardyce Nicoll. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956; pp. viii+168. $3.75.

For the first time the *Survey* focuses on a single play, rightfully enough *Hamlet*. Of all the plays *Hamlet* poses the most varied and

interesting problems for the scholar and critic, and has perhaps the most enduring appeal for the ordinary reader and playgoer.

The eight articles devoted to the play cover a wide range. Fredson Bowers re-examines the textual evidence for the crux, "solid flesh," and convincingly argues for the reading, "sallied" as a variant of "sullied." E.A.J. Honigman in a closely reasoned article succeeds in narrowing the possible date of the play to late 1599 or early 1600.

Discussing *Hamlet* as it may have been given at the Globe, George F. Reynolds raises again the question of the nature and employment of the inner stage. He suggests that the inner stage was far less frequently used than is generally thought, that many of the "room" scenes could have been played on the outer stage, and that the inner stage was used mainly for large scenes with the curtain separating the two stages drawn back. I believe that Mr. Reynolds is right. The dramatic and theatrical advantages of the front stage are so great that it must have been used as often as possible. Performances of *Henry V* and *The Beggar's Opera* have recently been given at the Sanders Theater in Cambridge on a stage with three playing levels and outer, inner, and side areas available—very much what we believe the Globe stage to have been. Seeing these productions I realized the wonderful potentialities of the Elizabethan stage and the magnificant theater it must have provided. The inner and outer stages at the Sanders Theater were employed much as Reynolds claims the Globe stage was. Intimate scenes were played on the front stage, actors bringing in the props and carrying them off again. One felt no loss of illusion. The gain in intensity and rapport was enormous.

"*Hamlet* Costumes from Garrick to Gielgud," by D. A. Russell, traces the changes in the costuming of Hamlet. It may be said that the apparel proclaims the interpretation and the age. Also dealing with the vagaries of taste is a study of *Hamlet* at the *Comédie Francaise* from 1769 to 1896. The French have never had the opportunity to see the play Shakespeare wrote. Even those productions most faithful to the text would likely have inspired in Shakespeare feelings like those Wagner had for the Paris production of *Tannhäuser*.

Perhaps the most disappointing item is R. A. Foakes' critical essay, "*Hamlet* and the Court of Elsinore." In claiming that critics have overemphasized the imagery of corruption and neglected the "good values of the court . . . presented through its honor and dignity," Mr. Foakes invites us to forget the murder of Hamlet's father, Polonius' cynical use of his daughter, the adulterous marriage of Gertrude, the treachery of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, and the perfidy of Laertes. It is difficult to agree that the corruption "exists chiefly in Hamlet's imagination."

Perhaps the most rewarding essay is a survey of the *Hamlet* criticism since 1900. With customary good sense Clifford Leech discusses the major trends. Surprisingly enough for one who has elsewhere written so well on the subject of tragedy, Mr. Leech does not explore very fully the nature of the tragedy in this play.

The remaining items in the *Survey* include a very amusing chapter in the development of the Romantic worship of Shakespeare, "Garrick's Stratford Jubilee: Reactions in France and Germany"; a brief account of the origin of the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana and of its Shakespeare resources; a discussion of the role of Shakespeare in the spiritual life of the Czech people ("He is on the side of moral laws against tyranny and violence"); and a hitherto unpublished contemporary setting of a Shakespeare song. As in previous years the *Survey* includes the very helpful review of Shakespearean studies.

ALBERT GILMAN,
*Boston University*

THE LIVING STAGE. By Kenneth Macgowan and William Melnitz. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955; pp. xiii+543. $8.00.

This encyclopedic survey of theater and drama, of performers and managers, even of archeology and technology, would seem destined for widespread endorsement as a theater history text. Authors Kenneth Macgowan and William Melnitz, both of the theater arts department of the University of California at Los Angeles, have produced an eminently readable volume aimed at the undergraduate student, and toward the common reader as well. *The Living Stage* was indeed written, as its publishers claim, "for enjoyable reading"; though the accompanying assertion that it also is "thoroughly sound and scholarly" tends to overstate matters.

As a popular "history of the world theater," *The Living Stage* achieves admirable continuity among its disparate component elements; and the book is notable for an abundance of fresh materials (especially the splendid chronology

tables and numerous line drawings) hitherto unavailable to the non-specialist. Its imaginative final chapter, "The Theater of Today and Tomorrow," is handsomely illustrated and unusually comprehensive in its controlled range of reference. The chapter concludes with this summation of its authors' convictions:

> Through a hundred centuries, theater has never died. *The* theater . . . may be destroyed, like its special god, and the parts of its body may be scattered abroad. But, because there is a kind of divinity about the theater, it is always born again. The history of the living stage proves the eternal vitality of the "fabulous invalid."

*The Living Stage* is frequently thus eloquent in behalf of its subject. Unfortunately, the journalistic impulse often overwhelms its authors; so that contributions made by several major figures are neglected on account of a predictably popular format.

Ibsen receives due attention as an important sociological force, and Shaw is regarded as a clever comic playwright; neither dramatist, however, is credited with key developments, historically, in theatrical art, as both ought certainly to be. Edwin Forrest is here treated as "'a vast animal bewildered by a grain of genius,'" along with "Continental Stars [!] Who Acted With [Edwin] Booth" in a somewhat uneven chapter on "American Theater—1800 to 1900." Probably the nineteenth-century American stage was not quite so gross as these authors tend to suggest.

Chapter Six, "The Theater That Elizabeth I Sustained," is as vital a reworking of familiar materials as the Edwin Booth, *et al*, chapter is choppily ill-wrought. Early woodcuts and modern line drawings (by Gerda Becker With) are presented in profusion, together with a richly informative text. Here contemporary stage craft and drama are merged toward a vivid sense of the Elizabethan (and Jacobean) theater in action.

In Chapter Eleven, "The Oriental Theater," reflective references to Shakespeare, Maeterlinck, O'Neill, and Rice establish convincingly that "a theater of remote symbolism" constitutes an important segment of living world theater. Significantly, the book's opening chapter, "Theater Begins with Primitive Man," initiates discussion of the living stage in the broadest terms possible, encompassing alike the prehistoric, cave-dwelling sorcerer and the American Indian dance-satirist of the present day.

When dealing with large patterns of theater history (central staging, the flexible proscenium, the wagon-stage, the multiple set) the authors are in authoritative control; and the final chapter is a *tour de force* in these patterns, modestly carried off by two experts. Occasionally the authors are moved to voice a healthy dissent from prevailing academic traditions. They argue, for example, that "the speaker called Chorus in *Romeo and Juliet* bunglingly betrays the plot. . . ." And some modern readers are likely to take issue with their old-fashioned view that "Restoration comedy . . . has none of the homely vigor of Molière or his honest, cleansing humor. No French drama, no drama of any other nation, has been so steadily and so studiedly salacious."

There are, finally, the usual inaccuracies of dates, titles, and spelling, normal to an ambitious history such as this. "José Zorrilla y Moral," "Nell Gwynn," and "Margot Jones" doubtless will be corrected in revision; and *"La Tour de Nesles"* and *"Becky Sharpe"* ought to be trimmed down slightly; though not much can be done about the "Theatre Royal"—"Theater Royal" imbroglio, in Chapters Eight and Twelve, that results from consistent employment of "theater." Chapter Five lacks complete citations of "Cervantes," "Vega," and "Calderón"; while its transliteration of *entremés* and redaction of *autos* as "'actions' or 'acts'" deserve editorial attention.

*The Living Stage*, in the words of its authors, was "designed as a survey to assist the playgoer, . . . also as a background for all formal theater courses." The tremendously difficult task of deciding what to include, what to leave out, has been accomplished creditably, to say the least; and the Macgowan and Melnitz history will serve its readers well—through the concept of a *living* stage, something universal, capable of being viewed imaginatively "as a single interwoven story."

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
*Colorado School of Mines*

MILTON AND SCIENCE. By Kester Svendsen. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956; pp. x+304. $5.50.

This volume presents a systematic study of Milton's scientific knowledge which influenced his thinking and writing. The author evaluates this knowledge in the framework of medieval and Renaissance treatment of science and shows that Milton largely followed tradition in developing arguments with scientific imagery. Because this imagery, which was clear to Milton's contemporaries, has lost much of its meaning to modern readers, Mr. Svendsen's in-

terpretations throw light on such passages as the dialectic of good and evil in *Paradise Lost*.

In his own words Mr. Svendsen's objective is "to discover the literary, the presentational, the imaginative relationship of materials isolated for the purpose from their context but worked back into it. . . . The place of science in Milton's art . . . is like that of theology, mythology, Biblical history, but with its own identity. Like them it supplies analogues, parallels, metaphors, symbols, the perception of which recovers to the imagination in this one regard the harmonious vision, the literary habit of mind which can respond to the poem. Unlike theology and the rest, the special identity of science is not abstract knowing or theorizing, but immediacy: it names things in a special way. Metaphors from science do not simply create fair pictures in the air; they lend to their context the sense of precision, objectivity. . . . They create a physical sense of order. . . ."

Any rhetorical study of Milton's works will profit from the contributions to the understanding of his thought provided by Mr. Svendsen's scholarly analysis of the scientific concepts he employed. Without this insight interpretation of meaning must be incomplete or distorted.

WILBUR E. GILMAN,
*Queens College*

A STUDY OF THINKING. By Jerome S. Bruner, Jacqueline J. Goodnow, and George A. Austin. With an appendix on lnaguage by Roger W. Brown. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956; pp. xi+330. $5.50.

Our intellectual history, the authors of this publication of the Harvard Cognition Project tell us, is marked by a heritage of naive realism. For Newton, science was a voyage on an uncharted sea whose objective was to discover the islands of truth which existed as entities in nature. Today science is hard put to shake the yoke of this dogma. The purpose of contemporary science is to invent such workable systems as logic and mathematics whose terms are used to denote discriminable aspects of nature and by whose means descriptions of the environment are formulated as we see it and according to our convenience. Contemporary science does not discover the ways in which events are grouped in nature—it invents them. The test of these inventions is the predictive benefits that result from the use of invented categories. Do such categories as tomatoes, lions, snobs, atoms, and mammalia exist? In so far as they have been invented and found applicable to instances of nature, they do. But they exist as inventions, not as discoveries.

Concomitant with this change in view, there has been a notable growth of interest in and investigation of the cognitive processes: the means whereby organisms achieve, retain, and transform information. Much of our commerce with the environment involves dealing with classes of things rather than with unique events and objects. Indeed, the case can be made that all cognitive activity depends upon a prior placing of events in terms of their category membership. A category is simply a range of discriminably different events that are treated "as if" equivalent. The book under consideration is concerned with the nature of psychological categories and with the strategies by which people come to discover what cues they can appropriately use for inferring the category membership of objects and events they may encounter.

The authors of this work did not have to travel very far afield to find themselves within the scope of interest of the professional in the field of speech. By definition, all the elements that make up utterance and spoken discourse are categories. The principal difference between identifying a visually presented object as an "apple," we are told, and a nineteenth-century statesman as a "Tory" lies not in the process of placement or identification but in the materials and cues utilized. Here is material to cogitate upon and consider at length.

The chapter on "Language and Categories" by Roger W. Brown is, of course, of direct and specific interest. A lucid, though closely packed, review of structural linguistics and its relation to semantics and language learning, it alone is worth the price of admission. The description of the rules of "The Original Word Game" should be required reading for anyone professionally concerned with speech and language learning, improvement, and correction from whatever point of view.

Although most of the material in this book is propaedeutic, the time spent in the reading and study of this closely packed and occasionally over-technical work could be therapeutic as well, if for no other reason than that it might conceivably restrict the incidence of hardening of the categories.

JOHN B. NEWMAN,
*Queens College*

LEADERSHIP AND ITS EFFECTS UPON THE GROUP. By Donald T. Campbell. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1956; pp. 92. $1.00.

The social scientist is often entreated to quit his laboratory, forsake his galvanometer or one-way screen, and come to grips with the harsh realities of the coal mine, tenement, or bargaining table. On occasion this solicitation has touched off investigations of such depth and authenticity that the findings reverberate for decades in the sometimes antiseptic pages of learned journals. On other occasions the temptation has yielded only pages of conjecture which are more appropriate to the Sunday supplement than to the scientific monograph. The appeal of the "world out there" is unmistakable; but one who succumbs to it must approach it with singular ingenuity and show unusual discernment in intrepreting its meaning.

Many of the opportunities and dangers of such field studies are illustrated in this monograph. It reports a study involving the six hundred men and sixty-nine officers belonging to a submarine squadron located at New London, Connecticut. The purpose was to determine how criteria of group effectiveness (productivity and morale in this case) are related to measures of individual leadership. A wide range of data collecting devices was used including questionnaires, various types of naval records, sociometric ballots, leader description forms, and a number of other rating scales. But the small size of the samples, the wide variability in scores, the difficulties in comparing measures involving different sets and numbers of judges, of men in different groups at different times, aptly illustrate the difficulties in studying "harsh realities."

One is justifiably disappointed in weighing the results obtained against the effort required. With some qualification it was found "that the successful leader or supervisor allows his subordinates responsibility and initiative, and is equalitarian and considerate in his treatment of them." This conclusion is to be found in the reports of other investigators whose methods were less cumbersome and whose results were more detailed and dependable.

The contribution of this study lies in the realm of methodology rather than in the realm of data. Not only is the author's opening review of standard experimental procedures (parallel and latin square, actuarial and correlational) an extremely clear and critical one, but thoroughout the study there are many penetrating observations concerning the suitability of traditional experimental practices. Those interested in conducting scientific studies of a psychological nature should examine particularly the author's concept of "methodological triangulation." This report should be of value in teaching graduate courses where it might be used to illustrate the obstacles and opportunities inherent in scientific research outside the comfortable confines of the psychological laboratory.

DEAN C. BARNLUND,
*Northwestern University*

*EVERYMAN'S* ENGLISH PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY. By Daniel Jones. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1956; pp. xiv+538. $5.00.

WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY, Concise Edition. David B. Guralnik, General Editor. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1956; pp. xiv+882. $3.00.

*Everyman's* is the eleventh edition of the Jones Dictionary, which in its earlier editions is presumably known to most of the readers of this journal. Here it has been revised, reset, enlarged to include 58,000 entries, and incorporated in Everyman's Reference Library. Apart from the enlarged vocabulary, the main change is a tightening of the transcription in order to differentiate such differences as those at the end of *windier* and *reindeer*, differences which are less noticeable in the "Received Pronunciation" of the south of England, on which the dictionary is based, than in American pronunciation.

Jones has always maintained, despite the advertising of his American publisher, that "Received Pronunciation," which he abbreviates as RP, is not for America. In this edition he states his position still more strongly:

> When I was in America in 1925, several American teachers (mostly from New York and the North-Eastern part of the United States) informed me, somewhat to my surprise, that RP or RP with slight modifications would be a suitable standard for teaching in American schools. This view is probably no longer held. In any case, I cannot think that any attempt to introduce this pronunciation into America is likely to meet with success. (p. xvi.)

The true value of the Jones dictionary is, of course, that it provides a useful comparison and contrast between Jones's RP and various American standards. Only a small minority of Americans has ever shown any interest in adopting Jones's standard, but that small minority has done much to discredit the teaching of speech in this country.

The concise *Webster's New World Dictionary* is a run-of-the-mill job which owes more to Clarence Barnhart than to Noah Webster. Indeed there is no Webster on its list of editors, and the dictionary owes no more to the lexicography of over a century ago than any other current dictionary. The one improvement is the use of the phonetic symbol [ŋ] for the last sound in *long*, where most other dictionaries cling to the ambiguous "ng."

Definitions and illustrations are about average. Some variations in pronunciation are given, but some important ones overlooked: the dictionary records only the eastern pronunciation of words like *carry*, and only the inland pronunciation of words like *hurry*. There is no evidence that the editors have relied on any outside advice; it is strictly an office job. Better dictionaries are currently available.

C. K. Thomas,
*Cornell University*

THE VOCABULARY OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN CLASSROOM SPEECHES. By John W. Black and Marian Ausherman. Columbus, Ohio: The Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1955; pp. 68.

It is refreshing to find among current literature a thoroughly functional contribution to the area of oral English. Such is this succinct report made on a study of the 288,152 words used by 274 male college students in 607 formal classroom speeches.

In the fourteen pages of discussion, the authors state that the study was initiated to fill a definite need for a quantification of oral English vocabulary. Previously, authors of tests related strictly to oral usage have had no recourse except to utilize studies of written vocabulary, such as Dewey's and Thorndike's, and to assume that they were valid indices to oral word usage.

The authors have arranged the 6,826 different words used by the speakers in their study in two lists, one according to frequency, the other alphabetically. Whereas the first nine words most frequently used by the speakers are the same words used most frequently in writing, significant differences were found between the words of Dewey's and Thorndike's lists and those of this study. For instance, one-tenth of the words used in the classroom speeches are not in Thorndike's list of 20,000 frequently-used words. The pronouns *we, our,* and *they* seem to be used more frequently in platform speaking than in writing, while the reverse is true of the pronoun *I*.

By teachers and authors who would broaden their awareness of the functional nature of spoken language, this brief treatise will be welcomed.

Empress Y. Zedler,
*Southwest Texas State Teachers College*

THE TEACHING OF LANGUAGE TO DEAF CHILDREN. By Agnes Lack. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955; pp. xv+380. $2.90.

This book makes worthwhile contributions to the development of language curricula for deaf children. Such outlines as exist lack expressed rationale and leave a heavy burden of interpretation and visualization to the teacher. Miss Lack corrects these faults by presenting a logical basis for the assignment of particular principles, constructions, and vocabulary to particular teaching stages, and by making a systematic effort to relate these materials in such a way as to set up teaching units.

She divides the language to be mastered by deaf pupils into seven stages based on the developmental instincts and expanding interests of the children. Within each stage, she organizes the material into lessons which bring together language principles, and vocabulary, suggesting suitable practice contexts. Teaching notes accompany each lesson, and brief sections on composition and speech work for each stage follow the language lessons. There is a special section devoted to the teaching of the backward senior pupil, and two appendixes deal briefly with common speech faults of the deaf and with the development of intonation patterns associated with different sentence types.

American teachers should find this book particularly stimulating. Miss Lack gives the nice attention to colloquial language characteristic of the work of English schools, and the slightly unfamiliar, English flavor of the practice material may point up stilted or hackneyed forms of expression entrenched in American schools, and suggest alternatives. No reference is made to the sentence "keys" or "slates" familiar to American schools, but the mention of a relatively clumsy substitute in the form of sentence building cards suggests that the author recognizes the need of some such device. American teachers may question the stage placement of certain principles (the very early introduction of the present progressive and present perfect tenses, for example), find certain emphases unfamiliar (such as the extensive treatment of the subjunctive mood), and counter some of Miss Lack's teaching procedures with

better ones (her treatment of indirect discourse and the passive voice seem particularly weak). Such assessment of the unfamiliar should have a beneficial effect on our thinking, particularly if it leads to experimentation.

Miss Lack stresses the scarcity of graded reading material available to English teachers, and this lack has undoubtedly influenced her language scheme, particularly for the senior stages. One of her aims for this level is "the understanding of mature language," and a large part of the work is given over to systematic study of advanced vocabulary, complex sentence structure, and relatively rare constructions ("lest," "in as much as") designed to increase reading comprehension. She stresses learning language in order to read, rather than reading in order to learn language. One is left with the impression that deaf teen-agers in England read fewer books than their American counterparts, and that those who achieve independence in reading at an adult level do so as a result of careful language preparation rather than the exposure in quantity often relied upon (for better or worse) in this country. It would be interesting to know the age-range of Miss Lack's seniors, their reading and grade levels in American terms, and the academic purposes and aims their language serves, both in the school for the deaf and after they leave it.

The chapters on senior work give discerning suggestions for meeting the needs of adolescent pupils and mobilizing the latent abilities of older children with poor attainment. The sections on speech present a quantity of practice material consisting mainly of children's verse, folk songs, and popular poetry. More of this literary emphasis in the speech period might be refreshing in American schools.

An index would be a helpful adjunct to this book, but its construction would be a formidable task.

HELEN M. E. WOODWARD,
*Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis*

TELEVISION IN THE MAKING. Edited by Paul Rotha. New York: Hastings House, 1956; pp. 215. $5.75.

MASS COMMUNICATION: TELEVISION, RADIO, FILM, PRESS. . . . By Erik Barnouw. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1956; pp. iii+272. College Edition, $3.50.

To the rapidly growing literature of mass communication Paul Rotha of London and Erik Barnouw of New York have now added slim volumes which combine significant information with delightful readability.

Mr. Rotha's *Television in the Making* is a collection of essays on the various divisions of the TV medium, written by sixteen practitioners from the B.B.C., three outstanding Americans, and one "international public servant." Paul Rotha is known chiefly because of his work in film and his histories of the cinema, but his recent stint as head of the B.B.C.'s Television Documentary Department has given him rare insight into the problems and challenges of the young medium. He approaches TV with sympathy and optimism, with none of the patronizing tone that has marked the writing of other film men. One regrets that Mr. Rotha's own contribution, besides selection and editing, does not occupy a larger share of the book.

The twenty chapters cover just about every aspect of television programming and production, with unusual sections on TV's world-wide role and on television criticism. American readers may be slightly confused, but are sure to be intrigued, by the differences between our "trade slanguage" and that of the United Kingdom. A thirty-page glossary of film and television terms, however, carefully includes American as well as British trade-talk, and is the most extensive and illuminating one this reader has yet encountered.

*Mass Communication,* on the other hand, is the work of one man, a man who has been an active and successful practitioner in at least three of the mass media he discusses. In addition, Erik Barnouw is a writer of great lucidity and charm. Rarely has so much material been presented in predigested form and still retained so much intellectual nourishment. Rarely have so many facts and ideas been presented in such compact yet eminently readable fashion.

Mr. Barnouw covers the history of the press, film, radio, and television, but makes that history incidental to our understanding of their influence. His section on the psychology of mass communication may draw heavily on the findings of others, but his clear and logical organization makes that material available to a new audience.

In describing the media and their workings he has taken pains to avoid writing a production handbook, or rather four production handbooks. Instead he has chosen to present the essential characteristics of the four media in a fashion calculated to make clear to the lay-

man or beginning student the peculiar nature of each, while inspiring the informed reader to nod agreement with his selection of essentials. Finally, in a section on the *sponsors* of mass communication (business, government, and organizations), Mr. Barnouw has brought into sharp focus the role that each plays in bringing its message to the mass audience.

For classes in broadcasting, on any level, *Mass Communication* provides invaluable supplementary reading. For courses concerned primarily with an understanding of social forces, the book is a necessity.

Mr. Barnouw concludes by saying, "Media can build bridges; they can also make walls. . . . But the need is for bridges." His book is one, and a good one.

EDWARD STASHEFF,
*University of Michigan*

THE EGGHEAD AND THE OTHERS. By Donley Feddersen. Chicago: Coach House Press, 1955; pp. 64. $2.75.

This "television fable" began as a "lecture on 'the Impact of Television' with illustrations added to dull the pain." It is quite likely the "lecture" and the illustrative "doodles" were reframed for publication upon the insistence of many people who had enjoyed so thoroughly seeing and hearing the "live" performance.

The story of "Professor Ovicaput" moves along with a merry pace punctuated with more than a few chuckles. In a few minutes you'll find yourself on the last page with the moral which "has very little to do with the story. That's the best kind."

Once through the fable, you're apt to find yourself going over the pages a second time to enjoy choice bits of the author's wit. And, in case you hadn't realized it at first, you note that the points of the lecture-story are clear, sound, and made very palatable by the clever presentation.

"Professor Ovicaput" struggles with great conviction to protect his family against the inroads of the modern monster. Indeed, he is quite alarmed about the influence of television on the "Others." He lectures to family, students, and townspeople to resist the "commodity-philosophy" of mass communication.

The "professor's" son was stimulated by all the talk about television so he slipped off to the neighbors to learn more about it. He learned. Now the "professor" and his family own a set. As a matter of fact, "Professor Ovicaput" now has his own show, "Life Is A Mess." He also has "his own agent, his own Cadillac and his own toupee," and a great deal of fan mail.

This jolly little book will never push some of the more comprehensive studies off your bookshelf. On the other hand, it wouldn't hurt one bit to slip a copy of *The Egghead and the Others* in amongst your other references. When you want a chuckle, you can open this fable—with "marginal doodles"—and find a very basic point, cleverly presented by a very competent broadcaster-teacher.

JOHN P. HIGHLANDER,
*KPIX-TV, San Francisco*

WHAT IS VITAL IN RELIGION. SERMONS ON CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN PROBLEMS. By Harry Emerson Fosdick. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955; pp. 238. $3.00.

Harry Emerson Fosdick, Minister Emeritus of Riverside Church in New York City, is also a kind of Minister Emeritus of all America. When Dr. Fosdick retired in 1946 from active parish and radio work, he had what was probably the largest personal and radio audience of any clergyman the world over.

This is Dr. Fosdick's eighth book of sermons, and, according to him, his last. These messages are not the work of a man who has "faded away." Instead, they seem to be the work of a man at the height of his power. In many ways, this is Dr. Fosdick's best volume of sermons. These sermons have the same superb qualities of his earlier messages: large religious resources related to the imperative needs of people; an unusually fine blend of skilled literary composition and good common speech; and telling illustrations, drawn from amazingly wide areas of human experience. Another quality is present, however, in larger measure in these sermons than in earlier messages by Fosdick. Faith tested by maturity is that quality. Although practical and "down-to-earth" these sermons also appear to have a stronger mystical element running through them than the sermons which have preceded them.

Dr. Fosdick aims these sermons at an ideal—what matters most in the sight of God, or what is vital in religion. He maintains that contemporary Christianity profoundly needs "a sense of what is vital in religion." Only this, he says, can overcome the divisions in Protestantism and win hungry and inquiring persons to the church. Fosdick insists that today's need is "for the indispensable vitalities of the Christian faith." And the supreme task of the churches is "to see them clearly, present them persuasively and live them devotedly."

A sampling of the major ideas in two of the sermons is indicative of the relevance and significance of the book. In "A Religion to Support Democracy," Dr. Fosdick says that democracy will be undergirded by "a religion that dignifies personality . . . ," recognizes a higher loyalty than the state, and cares "not only for liberty but for the equality and fraternity of the people." In "The Temptations of Maturity,' Fosdick declared that maturity faces the temptation to misuse power, to lose idealism and religious faith, and to become self-complacent, cocksure, and spiritually proud.

Another reviewer, Robert Luccock, has correctly said, "This book is good news for the preachers of America because, in the immortal words of television's George Gobel, 'You don't hardly get this kind any more.'"

EDMUND HOLT LINN,
*Andover-Newton Theological School*

STORYTELLING. By Claudia Royal. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1955; pp. 132. $2.00.

*Storytelling* is an explicit, succinct, well-written book for those who are interested in the ancient art of storytelling. The author approaches and presents the subject as an art in its own right, by showing how the voice and personality create an artistic word-picture. Just as one expresses ideas in sculpture, painting, or music, so the storyteller takes the ideas of a story and creates with words a picture that enchants the listener and affords rich, aesthetic enjoyment.

The author presents the thesis that everyone is a storyteller but that few people are "born" storytellers. Time and effort must be given in order to develop skill. Regardless of one's native endowment in this art, a study of technique is essential to effective communication.

The book begins with a short history of the ancient art. The history moves easily and rapidly from ancient man to contemporary times. From the historical background the book moves into the spiritual and intellectual values of storytelling. A strong emphasis is placed on the use of the story in teaching Christian morality. One chapter is devoted to the Bible stories and how they give significant religious meaning to all of life. Suggestions are given as to the most suitable stories for children, with the admonition that the teller "not assume a peculiarly sacred manner . . . [for] well-meaning teachers of religion have repelled rather than attracted children by their sanctimonious attitude." This type of sound advice is found throughout the book.

The major portion of the book is devoted to a discussion of choosing, preparing, and delivering the story. Suggestions are given as to how to select and prepare a story for nursery, beginner, primary, junior, and adolescent groups. At the end of each chapter there is a carefully selected, annotated bibliography. These recommended stories and book lists will be of great service to the teacher or to one in search of tested material.

The author of *Storytelling* is well qualified to write on this subject. She holds the degree of Doctor of Religious Education and has been a teacher of elementary children and a teacher of teachers for this age group. She writes with deep convictions. She moves from idea to idea with ease and assurance. This book will serve as an excellent text for one who is a novice and who needs guidance in the art of storytelling.

JOHNNYE AKIN,
*University of Denver*

BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF STUDIES IN VICTORIAN LITERATURE FOR THE TEN YEARS 1945-1954. Edited by Austin Wright. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956; pp. 310. $5.00.

Each year a bibliography of studies in Victorian literature is published in *Modern Philology;* each bibliography is compiled by specialists appointed by the Victorian Literature Group of the Modern Language Association of America. In 1945 the University of Illinois Press published a collection of these bibliographies for the first thirteen years of the project, 1932-1944; the present volume is a sequel to that collection.

No attempt has been made to combine the reports; each year's bibliography is reprinted separately within the collection; but the extensive index (pp. 272-310) gives, within a single alphabetical arrangement, the names of scholars whose work is being reported, the names of Victorian figures who are the subjects of study or are mentioned in the studies, and certain additional topical entries, place names, and subject entries. Each of the ten bibliographies is divided into these sections: I. Bibliographical Material; II. Economic, Political, Religious, and Social Environment; III. Movements of Ideas and Literary Forms: Anthologies; IV. Individual Authors.

Such bibliographies as this are of enormous use to teachers of interpretation, drama, rhetoric,

and public address who cannot be specialists in all periods covered by their interests. Similar bibliographies exist for other periods and areas of literature; probably the most comprehensive is that published annually by the Modern Language Association of America in *PMLA*.

WALLACE A. BACON,
*Northwestern University*

SIR KENELM DIGBY: THE ORNAMENT OF ENGLAND. By R. T. Petersson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956; pp. 366. $6.00.

This splendid life of "a virtuoso living half in the older world of the Renaissance, and half in the new world of professions and specializations," deserves attention simply on its merits as a vivid panorama of seventeenth-century English life. Noteworthy as the first editor of Ben Jonson's complete works, Sir Kenelm Digby maintained what evidently was "not only one of the choicest but also one of the largest" English libraries of its day. The "Digby MSS." of English history and science, the "Digby plays," and numerous medieval manuscripts—on deposit at the Bodleian Library, Oxford—are major literary documents. About forty volumes (mainly theological) which Digby sent to America, "added considerably to the nucleus of 350 or so with which John Harvard started the college library in 1638."

"A gentleman absolute in all numbers," Digby was born in 1603, the same year his father was executed horribly for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot. After loyal service to the Stuarts as envoy to Spain and as "privateer to the King," Sir Kenelm returned from exile during the Commonwealth to gain important status as "Cromwell's Catholic favourite," and lived his declining years, during the Restoration, as Royal Academy scientist and patron of the arts. Biographer Petersson's book is crowded with authentic love affairs, piratical exploits, spectacular duels, and diplomatic coups that often read like the pages of a fast-paced novel of adventure.

The remarkable protagonist, distinguished scholar and critic whom Johnson complimented as ". . . prudent, valiant, just and temperate: In him all virtue is beheld in state," rightly deserves to be called "The Ornament of England." R. T. Petersson has brought off a magnificent biography, at once scholarly and wonderfully alive, which can be "studied" with complete enjoyment.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
*Colorado School of Mines*

NORTH CAROLINA DRAMA. Edited with an Introduction by Richard Walser. Richmond, Virginia: Garrett & Massie, Inc., 1956; pp. 229. $4.00.

Editor Walser takes pains to correct a perhaps common misconception when he explains in his introduction to ten short plays by authors of his native state that the drama in North Carolina did not begin with the arrival in 1918 of "Proff" Frederick H. Koch at the University in Chapel Hill. We are reminded that as early as 1767 Thomas Godfrey wrote his *The Prince of Parthia* at Wilmington, and that the region has ever since enjoyed a highly respectable tradition of playgoing and playmaking.

Unquestionably Koch, a Kentuckian, did important work in fostering and giving prestige to Tar Heel playwrights. His common-sense demand that students write of characters and environments they best knew resulted in a body of regional drama impressive for its quantity and sincere intention.

The specifically North Carolina plays included in this volume share in common a fidelity to the people and manners of the state. Local anecdotes and regional dialects give them a distinctive flavor.

The reader who brings to these plays a familiarity with North Carolina should find the collection entertaining. The outlander may be less willing to overlook the amateurish quality of most of the scripts. Thomas Wolfe's almost comically inept *The Return of Buck Gavin* as well as *The Beaded Buckle* by Frances Gray Patton demonstrate how good writers can be less than ordinary dramatists. Only Paul Green, here represented by his long familiar *Quare Medicine* and *The No 'Count Boy*, rises above a kind of factual mediocrity. The inclusion of the remaining six plays (by William Norment Cox, John W. Parker, Wilbur Stout, Bernice Kelly Harris, Charles Edward Eaton and Fred Koch, Jr.) invites a suspicion that regional anthologists sometimes suffer from critical myopia.

JONATHAN CURVIN,
*University of Wisconsin*

THEATRICAL COMPANION TO MAUGHAM. By Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956; pp. vii+303. $8.50.

Theatre historians, students, just plain Maugham fans, and possibly memoir writers seeking dates, places, and names, will find the *Theatrical Companion To Maugham*, compiled

by Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson, a dependable, complete, original record of Mr. Maugham's long theatrical career. For example, we discover that his first produced play was a one-act written in 1896; never produced in English, it was translated into German as "Schiffbrüchig" (Shipwrecked) by Maugham himself and produced (possibly by Max Reinhardt) first, and last, in 1902 in Berlin. The book also contains the first information about an unknown, unproduced full-length play, "The Road Uphill," written at the height of Maugham's career in 1924. This unsuccessful play (Maugham was surprised when Mander and Mitchenson turned up a copy of the script, since he thought he had destroyed them all) was used later as the theme for his novel, "The Razor's Edge," published in 1944. This is the kind of intriguing information abounding in the *Companion to Maugham.*

The *Companion* gives the dates and details of the first performances of all his plays and their subsequent revivals, as well as dates and details of adaptations into film and/or radio dramas. All casts of all his produced plays are included, along with synopses, first night reviews, many excellent, nostalgic photographs, and a fine appreciation of Maugham's very considerable talents by J. C. Trewin.

Mr. Maugham approved the material and permitted quotations from his other writings to be used as commentaries on the plays.

HUBERT MOREHEAD,
*Long Beach State College*

COSTUMES AND STYLES. By Henry Harald Hansen. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1956; pp. 160. $5.95.

Ninety pages of carefully selected and authenticated costume color plates represent the comprehensive coverage clause in a figurative insurance blue book. Theatre directors and designers, constantly seeking assurance of visual effectiveness, will be interested in the benefits this book provides. Students of costume history and others desiring more knowledge of fashion's assets and liabilities will do well to acquaint themselves with this coverage.

Seven hundred line-and-color designs are presented in chronological order, beginning with the early Egyptian dynasties and extending through 1954. Naturally-posed figures of men, women, and children reveal the "set" of the costumes and the various lengths of such garments as the *chiton, manteau,* tunic, *et cetera* which, through their variations, indicate fashion changes peculiar to particular periods.

Grouping of costumed figures on double pages resembles a "costume key" with harmonizing and contrasting colors, simplicity and elaboration of line and décor, displayed as contemporary units and showing at a glance the relation of costumes, one to another. Captions point out significant details that even a keen eye might overlook in reviewing fashions of nearly five thousand years.

Consecutive numbering of designs facilitates identification of style with era, and aids in paralleling pictorial and descriptive data. Specific authenticating of the designs increases the reliability rating of the work.

Following the color plates is a section devoted to vivid résumés of style during nineteen periods of civilization. The influence of the social economy and the reflection of trends in furniture and architecture add sociological and esthetic significance to the descriptions of costume silhouettes.

Of all the costume books recently made available to a class of student directors and designers, *Costumes and Styles,* without exception, was the favorite. The reasons? (1) Clarity of detail, (2) comprehensive coverage, (3) visual effectiveness afforded by the lovely Danish-printed color plates.

EDNA WEST,
*Northwestern State College of Louisiana*

THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PUPPET THEATRE. By George Speaight. New York: John de Graff, Inc., 1955; pp. 343. $5.50.

For those who would like more than a superficial acquaintance with puppets and their background, this book gives a fascinating account from their origins in ancient Greece to the remarkable revival of present day puppetry. More specifically, it dwells on the Elizabethan motions, the Restoration Punchinellos, and the fashionable marionette theatres of 18th-century London. It brings the reader the curious history of Punch and Judy and their traveling showmen who played a large part in the entertainment world of our ancestors.

Though the author claims not to be a scholar, he has ably provided a comprehensive and thoroughly documented study. The inquiring reader will find extensive notes and bibliography as well as two appendices containing a list, complete and detailed as possible, of all the English puppet showmen who plied their art between 1500 and 1914, plus a list of all the plays performed on the English puppet stage

between 1500 and 1914. Mr. Speaight's long experience as a puppet showman qualifies him to select from a lifetime of research on the subject the material best suited for reader interest.

JEAN STARR WIKSELL,
*Baton Rouge, Louisiana*

ORAL COMMUNICATION. By Paul Dickerson Brandes. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1956; pp. 211. $2.75.

*Oral Communication* contains introductory remarks and twelve projects. Although designed for a quarter system, the book could be used in a semester course. It is oriented in the emphases of public address and is intended for the beginning speech or communication course. Brandes says in the preface that the book is a "manual . . . neither textbook nor workbook. . . . Sufficient explanatory material has been included with each unit to simulate the textbook approach, while enough space has been devoted to planned exercise to satisfy much of what a workbook may provide."

Projects are designed for a prescribed order, but other arrangements are possible. Work sheets are plentiful, varied, large, and usable. Text explanations go to the point quickly and most of the generalizations are supported with fresh, relevant material. The style is sometimes admirably terse; it is usually vigorous, sometimes complex, almost always alive.

An amazing amount of material is condensed, and well condensed for the reader with adequate background. Most students will need help with concepts and terms, particularly in voice, language, and reasoning, in order to make the discriminations and judgments required by the projects. Text materials are necessarily brief in this kind of book, and Brandes has been unwilling to explain the obvious in order to guarantee comprehension.

A teacher of the short course can well afford to examine this book rather carefully.

CHARLES T. BROWN,
*Western Michigan College*

AN OUTLINE OF ENGLISH PHONETICS. By Daniel Jones. Eighth Edition. New York: E. P. Dutton, and Company, Inc., 1956; pp. xx+378. $4.50.

Some significant new materials:

1. The diphthong in *day*, etc. has a more open (lower) or even a closer first vowel.

2. The vowel in *cross*, etc. tends to be short (rounded).

3. "Linking" r in *more and more*, etc. tends to disappear.

4. Words like *greatcoat*, etc. lose the second stress, and *hospitable*, etc. shift stress to second syllable.

5. "Intermediate" *a* in *ask*, etc. often shifts to the *ah* sound, whereas *ah* in *telegraph*, etc. may become the short sound in *cat*.

6. Diphthongs, especially rising ones, have been given new treatment. See *Miscellanea Phonetica* (IPA) 1954.

7. New items on assimilation (term *similitude* brought in), stress intonation, syllable division, and transcription (types, including "simple").

8. Appendix on American Pronunciation enlarged, but still brief.

Among references *Zeitschrift fur Phonetik* is probably familiar, but its *Beihaft I*, "Festschrift Panconcelli-Calzia," is new to this reviewer.

The *Outline*, taken together with Jones's *Phoneme* (1950), *Pronunciation of English* (1956, 4th edit.), and *English Pronouncing Dictionary* (1956, new edition), will be useful to all, even American phoneticians. The President, and long-time Secretary, of the International Phonetic Association, has been criticized for being a "practical" phonetician. Surely he is.

BERT EMSLEY,
*Ohio State University*

GUIDES TO STRAIGHT THINKING. By Stuart Chase. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956; pp. 212. $3.50.

This most recent book by Stuart Chase focuses on everyday applications of logic and logical fallacies. The author begins by discussing the history of logic and the contributions of science and semantics to Aristotelian logic. The bulk of the book, however, concerns itself with "13 Common Fallacies" that Chase has selected from a twenty-four page treatise by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The author is not concerned with academic classification of fallacies but, like any good popularizer, concentrates on providing "the journeyman thinker" with an understandable and usable list.

The book was "written for people like myself who have been thrown for a loss in trying to understand formal expositions of logic." In keeping with this purpose, lay instead of Latin labels are used, whereby *argumentum ad hominem* becomes "Getting Personal" and *post hoc ergo propter hoc* is labeled "Cause and Effect." The rudiments of formal logic are brought to life in an informal and highly readable way

through the use of numerous and often entertaining examples.

This book should prove highly useful, not as a competitor for the standard text in logic or argumentation, but as collateral reading which students will find both interesting and profitable.

FRANK E. FUNK,
*Syracuse University*

ARISTOTLE: RHETORIC, AN ABSTRACT OF PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Pat M. Ryan, Jr. Golden, Colorado: Colorado School of Mines, n.d.; pp. 17. $1.00.

With the amount of unaided study necessary for undergraduates to gain a working concept of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, there ought to be a place for Pat M. Ryan's précis. In his preface, Ryan says that this brief summary "has mainly been designed to fill, if possible, the lacuna in speech education of a practical, readable abridgment of working fundamentals set forth long ago by its author."

In his effort to provide a useful study guide for public speaking, Ryan has retained the sequence of Aristotle's materials, designating sources from the standard Berlin Greek text in the margins. Four pages are devoted to Book One, seven pages to Book Two, and three pages to Book Three. There is a liberal amount of footnote reference to other philosophers and rhetoricians, but none to various interpreters and commentators on the *Rhetoric*. The précis contains quotations from the W. Rhys Roberts translation of the *Rhetoric*, on which it is based, although quoted material is not distinguished from paraphrased material.

The discussion of Book One omits Chapter 15, since Ryan dismisses the "non-technical" proofs as primarily juridical. The usefulness of the summary might have been broadened by the addition of a bibliography of translators and commentators on the *Rhetoric*, and even an occasional reference to E. M. Cope's *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric* (1867) would not have been out of order. Finally, a brief comment on Aristotle's composition of the *Rhetoric* and the reasons for its appearance might well have served to broaden the possible application of the précis.

*Aristotle: Rhetoric, An Abstract of Principles of Public Speaking* fills well the void pointed out by Ryan in his foreword. Not only does it introduce students to the fundamentals of public speaking but it also serves as a useful study guide in seminars on rhetoric and speech education.

PAUL D. BRANDES,
*Mississippi Southern College*

A MANUAL FOR BEGINNING DEBATING. By Douglas R. Sherman. Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State University Press, 1956; pp. 16. $.50.

Here is an inexpensive, practical debating manual that should prove helpful to debaters everywhere. It is clearly written and is based on generally accepted theory and techniques. Naturually, no abridged work of this type can possibly replace longer treatises, but that is obviously not its purpose.

This booklet should be especially useful as a supplementary support to a more complete debate text. It might be wise to begin with the manual and consult recognized texts as more elaborate explanation is required.

Despite its brevity, the manual contains materials concerning preliminary steps, types of cases, analysis, issues, contentions, argument, evidence, persuasion, and judging. The sections devoted to types of cases and analysis are especially interesting and informative.

JAMES A. ROSS,
*Baldwin-Wallace College*

FACE YOUR AUDIENCE. By William Hodapp. New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1956; pp. 130. $3.95.

This is a handbook of audition material essentially useful to those who have no other access to readings appropriate for television. The selections cover a wide scope of program and character types, mixing the new with the old. They are cut to audition length. Although there are sections on "Notes to Actors," "Additional Sources of Audition Material," a Bibliography, and a "Sample Pronunciation Guide," they are of dubious value to either the professional or the amateur. The exercises, however, might be used in a class in television acting, or possibly by a television director who is forced to recommend material to aspiring hopefuls.

ROBERT P. CRAWFORD,
*Michigan State University*

HUMAN RELATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS. By Seymour W. Beardsley and Alvin G. Edgell. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956; pp. 40. $1.00.

The Washington Seminary on International Affairs, a Friends Service Committee project,

was asked in 1953 to prepare a set of readings for the forthcoming Conference of the U. S. Commission for UNESCO. That bibliography, after being expanded and revised, is now being made available to the general public by the Public Affairs Press.

This guide cuts across the area loosely described as "human relations." Represented in its listings are the works of philosophers, historians, and men of wide practical experience, as well as the writings of leading anthropologists and social psychologists. The bibliography is concisely and accurately annotated. Most of the items included are familiar ones, but here and there one finds a reference to books which seem technically unrelated to our work but which turn out to have a direct and unexpected bearing on it.

DEAN C. BARNLUND,
*Northwestern University*

SHAKESPEARE'S GLOBE PLAYHOUSE. By Irwin Smith. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956; pp. xxiii+240; 31 plates; 12 line drawings; 15 scale drawings. $7.00.

John Cranford Adams' *The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment* was published by the Harvard University Press in 1942. Subsequently, he and Irwin Smith, "artist by profession and a Shakespearean by avocation," built a scale model of their playhouse which has been exhibited since 1950 at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington. To accommodate numerous requests for scale drawings from which models of the Globe might be built, Mr. Smith has produced the present volume.

The handsome new book describes the theatre in detail, from the "pit" to the "huts." The use of the multiple stage is clarified by a conjectural description of *Romeo and Juliet* and *2 Henry IV*. The study concludes with the promised scale drawings, fifteen in all, including floor plans at each level, exterior elevations, interior sectional views, and an elevation and section of the acting area.

Mr. Smith has beautifully illustrated Dr. Adams' work. The lively discussion of Tudor carpentry is absorbing stuff. The stage director will find valuable suggestions in the many carefully reasoned examples of the stage in use. Globe models will probably flourish. And these may inspire the construction on some fortunate campus of the full-scale playhouse. Dare we hope so?

However, scholars will be jittery about the skimpy documentation. To follow the fully documented argument behind the evolution of each detail of this Globe, one must refer to the earlier study. Mr. Smith often describes Professor Adams' Globe as if it were a fact rather than an elaborate scholarly conjecture.

Further, those specialists who were uneasy about the astounding completeness of the Adams Globe, will find little that is new here to calm them. There is still abundant generalization. If you insist on the passionate caution of a George F. Reynolds, then you will wish that there were not quite such "definite forms and dimensions and positions to every individual piece of timber, every baluster, every brick."

But if this is your Globe, if you are not a convert of Leslie Hotson or C. Walter Hodges, then Mr. Smith's book belongs in your Elizabethan collection. Certainly, the exciting workability of the Adams-Smith Globe has been shown time and again in production. It is a superb platform stage. And if the Globe did appear in 1600 as Irwin Smith draws it for us today, Shakespeare was indeed a lucky theatre man.

J. D. CLAY,
*Oberlin College*

PRACTICAL SPEECH. By H. Keith Slothower. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1956; pp. 90. $1.60.

*Practical Speech* is designed to meet the needs of beginning speech students in colleges, adult education programs, and high schools. It is based on a sound philosophy: namely, to help each student (1) determine objectives significant for his attainment, (2) want to attain his objectives, (3) understand how to attain them through planned speech performances for which he prepares well, (4) receive "suggestions for successful development and faults to be avoided," and (5) "experiment with suggestions and apply those which seem to fit his speaking personality." Obviously, it is student-centered and functional.

It presents basic and essential material for beginners, even if the material may be, in instances, too elementary, scanty, and inaccurate. In outline-essay form, the author presents thumbnail suggestions on such topics as speech and communication, voice, choosing topics, organizing speeches, adjusting to speaking situations, use of language, pronunciation, control of physical movement, rhythm, oral reading, and practical hints for effective speaking. He presents examples of clumsy sentence-structure, words for checking pronunciation, oral reading exercises, enunciation exercises, sixteen oral assignments of two to ten minutes in length, and seventeen pages of rating sheets.

The emphasis is on student performance and development. Beginners can develop with the aid of this "text-handbook" if such books as those listed in the bibliography are provided as essential references.

HUGH F. SEABURY,
*State University of Iowa*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

FROM THE MODERN REPERTOIRE, SERIES THREE. Edited by Eric Bentley. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956; pp. 527. $7.50.

THE BEST SHORT PLAYS OF 1955-1956. Edited by Margaret Mayorga. Boston: Beacon Press, 1956; pp. 305. $1.25.

GREAT CHRISTIAN PLAYS: A COLLECTION OF CLASSICAL RELIGIOUS PLAYS. . . . Edited by Theodore MacLean Switz and Robert A. Johnston. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1956; pp. xii+306. $7.50.

MELODRAMAS AND FARCES FOR YOUNG ACTORS. By Earl J. Dias. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1956; pp. 263. $4.00.

PRIZE PLAYS FOR TEEN-AGERS: A COLLECTION OF ONE-ACT, ROYALTY-FREE PLAYS FOR ALL OCCASIONS. By Helen Louise Miller. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1956; pp. 504.

THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE COLD WAR. Edited by Grant S. McClellan. The Reference Shelf, Volume 28, Number 6. New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1956; pp. 201. $2.00.

THE DANIEL WEBSTER READER. Edited by Bertha M. Rothe. Docket Series, Number 5. New York: Oceana Publications, 1956; pp. 255. $1.00.

CREATIVE COMMUNICATION. By Edwin Laird Cady. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1956; pp. 158. $2.50.

TEACHING BY CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISION. . . . Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1956; pp. ix+66. $1.00.

AN INTERPRETATION OF AUDIO-VISUAL LEARNING AIDS: AN EDUCATIONAL MONOGRAPH. By Maurice S. Stokes. Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1956; pp. 94. $2.00.

YOU CAN TEACH A CHILD THAT READING CAN BE FUN. . . . By Ellen C. Henderson, with a Foreword by Florence Colell Coyle. New York: Exposition Press, 1956; pp. 172. $3.00.

A TEACHER IS A PERSON. By Charles H. Wilson. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956; pp. 285. $3.75.

THE APPROACH TO SELF-GOVERNMENT. By Sir Ivor Jennings. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956; pp. viii+204. $3.00.

HOW TO ACHIEVE POLITICAL GREATNESS. By Wayne M. Mann. New York: Exposition Press, 1956; pp. 122.

THE ROGUE OF PUBLISHERS' ROW: CONFESSIONS OF A PUBLISHER. By Edward Uhlan. New York: Exposition Press, 1956; pp. 247. $3.50.

# SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

## New Management

With this issue, Shop Talk is under new management. The past, and first manager of the branch, Loren Reid, has moved upstairs to the President's suite. The new manager has worked for the firm, in somewhat dilatory fashion, for a quarter of a century, but merely as writer and reviewer, never even aspiring to the junior executive class. He pledges a continuation—insofar as he can—of the past policy which has been so well received. "What suggestions do you have as to what should go into or be left out of Shop Talk?" I asked in the first appeal for news. Opinion on the column, consistently laudatory, was enough to make a new man's hair stand on end. "First thing I read"—"Keep up that sophisticated, witty tone"—"Best thing in the *QJS*"—etc., etc. Some positive suggestions and cautions received: "More interest area news"—"Give the little schools a break"—"Keep out the big school propaganda." One realist appeals, "Include as many signs of progress as possible, new equipment, facilities, and such. They help local negotiations." Well, $ST_2$ will try for an issue or two. He solicits your support in supplying intelligence.

Although this is but the second editorial sequence of the *Journal* to carry a Shop Talk, the idea of a gossip column goes back to Vol. VIII, No. 2 (April, 1922). The first issues had a generous Forum section, but no news and notes. But Editor Woolbert, in his third year in the editorial offices at the other end of the Illinois Broadwalk from where this is written, reared back and announced that since there had been a "more or less persistent call for a department that will furnish items of news, . . . the editor wishes to announce that from time to time there will appear a department known as News and Notes." The new section would carry such items as "New Class Room Methods," and "Formation of New Debating, Oratorical and Discussion Leagues." These matters, he thought, would make "good reading." Among items "not deemed of general interest" were listed "Debate Victories," and "Personals." Through the years the back pages were expanded from time to time to include *Old Books, Among the Contributors, Conventions and Conferences, Equipment*, etc., until Editor Howell, in 1954, decided to lump all this into one odds-and-ends, potpourri, salmagundi called Shop Talk. All that remained was to select the man. To Shop Talk Reid's general estimable qualifications there was one deciding virtue. He was, at time of appointment, incarcerated incommunicado in the British Museum, and defenseless. This brings us up to date. Carry on!

## On Conventions

1956-1957 may go down as quite a convention year. Not only were the political parties hard at it in Chicago and in San Francisco; the speech societies threaten to outdo themselves. SAA held one convention in December, and is scheduled to do another in August. Central States meets in April, and again in December. With all this activity, perhaps a few random thoughts on conventions are in order.

It is hard to believe that once upon a time the feasibility of conventions was actually argued. If one looks in Professor Gray's *Index*, one can locate articles in the *QJS* on the matter. Today, about all that is argued is time and place. These are still critical matters. How can the dear children explain to their playmates why daddy takes off each year before Christmas, and doesn't return until after the New Year's celebration? Some years ago Professor Brigance as a member of a time and place committee set out to find a congenial place and a suitable time. He thought he had both until he talked to the hotel manager. "We can't give you a convention reservation except in some off season such as Christmas," said the manager. "Why not?" asked the arranger. "Because teachers' groups are not desirable." One can imagine the indignation, the incredulity in the arranger's voice: "Undesirable? How are they undesirable?" Said the manager coldly: "Because they don't spend enough money on tips, liquor, and women." That's one reason for a Christmas convention; no sensible, prosperous businessman would spend his holiday on a business trip. So the hotels are available to teachers.

But whether conventions are held in June or December, there is a hardy breed that will attend them, and then argue which was the best one. Some hold out for Salt Lake, others for New Orleans. Shop Talk has some nominations of his own. As the most wondrous, he would cite the 1950 New York convention, in two hotels, and with a program running to 104 pages. Most triumphant, the Chicago, 1939 event; attendance went over 1,000 for the first time. As the most recreational and scholarly, the Eastern States 1934 convention in Atlantic City. Strolls along the Boardwalk, not many meetings, and choice of hot or cold, fresh or salt water in the tub. With Wayland Maxfield Parrish in the chair, Lane Cooper and Father Donnelly on classical rhetoric, Winans on public speaking, Marvin Herrick, Drummond, and Barrett H. Clark on the theatre—what more could a conventioneer want!

The first national convention one attends is bound to last in memory. Take the 1927, Hotel Sinton, Cincinnati meeting. There was a convention for you! Two hundred thirteen people were there, and they got their names embossed one by one in the *QJS* (XIV, 1928, 146-151). Things are not done that way now. And how the ideas flowed. Was Behaviorism or Gestalt the psychology to use? Do the vocal cords function in opposite phase and nodal, or in phase and total? Editor Everett Hunt reported that the cover of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education* was dull and the type hard to read. He moved to drop the word *Education* from the title, and was sustained. But when he moved to drop *Quarterly* he was scotched. A progressive but sensible convention, that one in 1927.

At his first national convention, your correspondent carefully observed the conduct of the distinguished members, and received advice from them. Some of the observations, some of the counsel are still clear. W. M. Parrish is rather inclined to take conventions at their face value, have his papers well in hand, attend sessions, and get to bed early against a hard day ahead. Winans advocated doing the convention in the lobby. He held that papers are a necessary part of conventions, but a necessary evil. Papers, he declared in fine abstinence, he could take or leave alone. Drummond loved it all, but wouldn't admit it. He would hold court in the lobby, venturing into meetings now and then to show respect for a person on a program, or to satisfy some curiosity. It never took much urging to get him into a room for a little conviviality. And when most of the hotel was abed, he could be counted on for a late supper party at an all-night restaurant down the street. Afterwards, if you cared to walk him to his room, you could see him lean his crutches against a chair in that combination of affection and disgust he expressed towards those sticks that made locomotion possible, throw himself on the bed, physically exhausted, but eager to talk, listen, and talk.

One very fine lesson I learned at the 1927 convention was taught by the old master, Hoyt Hudson. He drifted in after doing the MLA meeting in Louisville. At breakfast, he spread the morning program before us. As my eyes popped at the wonders, he observed: "Nothing much on. Let's do the book stores." And so we were off to that wonderful place, alas now extinct, Maroney's. But since that day I have always tried to include some little bit of culture in a convention stay. If in Chicago, perhaps the Stockyards, or if in New York, a ferry ride to Hoboken. It may have been overdone a bit in Los Angeles last year, with a tour through the movie studios, and a view of the Tournament of Roses and the Rose Bowl. But this is a warning that in August ST plans personally to inspect the tower of old North Church to see if it has been properly restored.

### Invitation

Readers are cordially invited to send in items of interest.

The April issue will feature "Retirement." News on those about to retire, or having retired, will be especially appreciated.

If items are classified on separate sheets—retirement on one, new buildings on another, etc.—copy can be sent on to the printer handily without interfering with the individual style of the contributors.

Address: SHOP TALK—R. Murphy—204A Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

### Why Conventions

At a convention post-mortem critique session recently, the question was raised as to why people come to conventions anyway. ST put the query to six tried and true conventioneers, in various areas of speech. Three replied. Frank M. Rarig, Emeritus of Minnesota, one of the founding fathers, one of the seventeen who put their names on that fateful document November 28, 1914, which begat the SAA, replies:

"Dear Dick, Yes, I was one of the founders, but it is my recollection that I did not attend the first convention; the reason I have forgotton. I have no record of attendance other than the ones in the *QJ*. Just now I am in such a state of poor health that I can make no commitment to accept your invitation. Winans could do what you want if in condition, but his age and health may preclude his attempting it.

"I have missed too many conventions. Here's hoping that you may find someone who is young enough in spite of age to do what you want."

Dina Rees Evans of Cleveland Heights High School replies:

"One reason that I go to conventions—besides the important one of seeing my friends—is to make sure the voice of the high school is heard from and not drowned by the voice of the colleges. I'm always glad that I went, but particularly so if the high school division gets all "het" up about something and the sparks fly in every direction!"

W. Norwood Brigance of Wabash replies:

"David Lloyd-George's daughter was asked why she saved newspaper criticisms of her father. She replied, 'For Father to read; they are good for his soul'.

"Year after year I teach students who—presumably—know less than I. It is easy by degrees to become complacent, almost unconsciously to develop an attitude that, 'I know all I need to know', and to stop growing intellectually.

"A convention makes me humble again. I meet somebody in the lobby, and ask in greeting, 'What are you doing these days?' He tells me he is experimenting with a new method of motivating sophomores; and I wonder why I had not thought of that. I attend half a dozen sectional meetings. I hear perhaps twenty-five papers: On research in how to teach Interpretation effectively. On communication techniques used by the Air Force. On Ramus and sixteenth-century education. On what the First Course should contain. On Burke and the Dinner Bell legend. I feel like a man gazing into the universe through the lens of the Palomar telescope. For three convention days I am in the midst of people who possess infinite knowledge, who constantly are expanding that infinite universe, and who are engaged in defining what it means.

"I return home no longer complacent, but knowing that I am in the position of that DC-7 pilot who said, 'In my business so much is being discovered that you've got to run like hell to stand still.'"

### Shop Talk Poll on Conventions

In his request for news, sent to 200 schools, ST enclosed a questionnaire about conventions and convention travel. One hundred seventeen replies were received.

*Time*

| | Number | Per cent |
|---|---|---|
| Christmas | 46 | 39 |
| Late summer—between summer term and fall term | 41 | 35 |
| During school year | 19 | 16 |
| Alternate | 2 | 2 |
| No opinion | 9 | 8 |
| | 117 | 100 |

*Travel Allowance*

| | Number | Per cent |
|---|---|---|
| No allowance | 6 | 5 |
| Full allowance (all expenses) | 6 | 5 |
| First-class travel | 7 | 6 |
| Coach travel | 27 | 23 |
| Part travel | 19 | 16 |
| Token encouragement, depending on budget, distance, number attending, etc. | 37 | 32 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Flat fee—$25.00-$150.00 | 4 | 3 |
| Amount determined by extent of participation | 11 | 10 |
| | 117 | 100 |

*Requirements For Travel Allowance*

| | Number | Per cent |
|---|---|---|
| Must be on program or officer | 48 | 43 |
| Full if officer or on program, part if not | 13 | 12 |
| Participation in program if influential | 12 | 11 |
| No strings | 38 | 34 |
| | 111 | 100 |

COMMENTS ON THE QUESTIONS. In regard to time, the supporters of Christmas seem to be resigned to it. "Must be something better but we can't think of it," they wrote. The supporters of the fall time are anxious to see what happens in Boston in August. Through most of the answers runs a tone of doubt and possibility.

The variety of forms of travel allowance for conventions defies statistical compilation. Drury College, for example, allows half fare and $5.00 per diem for a delegate, three-fourths fare and $7.50 per diem for a participant, and full fare and $10.00 per diem for an officer. At Oberlin, travel allowance is available for one convention for those not on the program, but for two conventions to those participating. At Westminster (Pennsylvania), a delegate to a convention must give an oral report before the faculty. The best Hawaii hopes for is plane fare to San Francisco; it's on their own from there. Some of the plans are very simple. Oklahoma A & M reports six cents a mile travel, $10.00 per diem, no strings. "No allowance whatever," reports Packard at Harvard. From Haberman at Wisconsin comes the sad report, "None, nothing, zero, not a hapenny."

LOOKING BACKWARD—FROM THE FILES

*1917.* The Jan. *Q.J. Pub. Speak.* reported that at the 1916 convention (the second annual), the "question was raised of the proper time and place for our annual gathering. . . . It was said that we should meet during the Christmas holidays . . . take at least three days . . . and arrange a program which would leave the evenings free for recreation and informal visiting." It was argued that the convention should be moved from New York and be held "in Chicago, or in some other city more nearly in the center of the country."

*1927.* The Apr. *Q.J. Sp. Educ.* reported the 1926 Chicago convention. President Mabie recommended "that the sectional organization of the convention and of the Association be continued because it fosters closer coöperation among persons interested in specialized fields."

*1937.* The Feb. *Q.J.S.*, Editor Wise reporting, noted that the proceedings of the 1936 St. Louis convention were so prolix that "the minutes and committee reports published in toto would fill a moderate-sized issue of the *Quarterly Journal.*"

*1947.* The April issue noted that the 1946 convention at the Sherman in Chicago was "attended by over twelve hundred members . . . largest attendance . . . in the history of the Association." There were twenty-one sectional meetings and five general sessions, in addition to many other attractions.

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR—1957

National

Speech Association of America: Hotel Statler, Boston, August 25-28.

American Educational Theatre Association: meets with SAA in the late summer meeting.

American Speech and Hearing Association: Netherland Hilton, Cincinnati, November 20-22.

The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Coöperation, National University Extension Association: Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, December 27-28. The committee breaks its tradition of meeting with SAA because of the August convention.

Regional

Central States Speech Association: Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, April 5-6; Hotel Sherman, Chicago, December 27-28.

Speech Association of the Eastern States: Sheraton-McAlpin Hotel, New York, April 11-13.

Southern Speech Association: University of Georgia, Athens, April 1-6.

CALENDAR. This is the time of year when everyone should have his pocket calendar and diary well selected and in operation. An old college chum, now famous as exposer of communists and communist fronters, sends along a handsome little pocketbook diary, issued by the World Federation of Democratic Youth, Budapest, Hungary. Extremely handy little volume. To be sure, almost anyone would know the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington, but those of Marx and Stalin, ordinarily not recorded on

the kitchen calendar, are more difficult to recall. And without such a diary, how would one readily know that by using one of the 112 elevators in the Lomonosov University in Moscow he can reach the top floor of the science building in thirty-five seconds. And it would be easy to forget that on February 21 comes International Day of Struggle Against Colonialism and of Solidarity with the Youth of the Colonial Countries.

## SHOP TALK CONVENTION CALENDAR—RELATED ORGANIZATIONS—1957

International Conference on Audiology: Chase Hotel, St. Louis, May 13-16.

National Catholic Theatre Conference: Kansas City, June 13-15.

National Council of Teachers of English: Leamington Hotel, Minneapolis, November 28-30.

Pi Kappa Delta National Convention: South Dakota State College, Brookings, April 15-19.

Phi Rho Pi National Convention: Bakersfield College, Bakersfield, California, April 18-20.

Tau Kappa Alpha National Conference: Butler University, Indianapolis, April 15-17.

THE PERSONAL TOUCH. In these days of IBM cards and general mechanization, the individual shining through some communication is a joy to behold. The Lexington (Kentucky) Library Service has a page cover-letter on its list of used books for sale. "We do hope," reads the letter, "that you and all of yours have been well and enjoying the best of health since our last list went to you, seems like just about everything else will work out alright if we can just stay in good health. And if any of you are sick when you receive this list and cannot afford to buy a few books and will drop us a card we will send you something to read and will remember you in our prayers." The address is P.O. Box 63.

THE CHAPA LETTER. Under this title the Committee on the History of American Public Address issues a very newsy little letter, telling about goings on in their field. Copies will be sent, on request to R. G. Gunderson, 329 Edgemeer Place, Oberlin, Ohio. The series was begun in 1948.

ON THE HUSTINGS. Curious about the outcome in the Michigan election last fall, ST asked Paul D. Bagwell of Michigan State if he would report on his campaign for state Auditor General. The office was of particular interest in the mid-west because the auditor of one of the states in the region was doing time for embezzling a million or so. Candidate Bagwell kindly sent on his report:

> "I lost the election by 32,000 votes. This was a little less than 1% of over 3,000,000 votes cast for the office of Auditor General. My out-state plurality was 296,000 votes. My opponent's plurality in Wayne County was so great that he turned this into a defeat. Mayor Cobo of Detroit, our gubernatorial nominee, lost Wayne County by 380,000 votes. This was sufficient to pull the whole state ticket down. I wound up leading the state Republican ticket, and next to Eisenhower, I received the greatest number of votes in Michigan.
>
> "I campaigned on a full-time basis, 16 to 18 hours a day, from September 9th until November 7th. During this time I was on leave of absence, without pay. I averaged 8 to 9 speeches a day and spent numerous hours in front of factory gates shaking hands with as many of the voters as possible. I appeared on about a dozen television shows for a total of 2 hours and 15 minutes. I spoke over radio 6 times for a total of about an hour and a half. I would estimate I was on television in Wayne County, where over a million votes were cast, for not more than six minutes (3 appearances). I didn't have one radio program in this area. This may, in part, account for the showing in Wayne County. I didn't go into the County except on four occasions, and generally I appeared before minority groups on these occasions. I didn't do more campaigning in Wayne County because three of those on the State Ticket were residents there and the campaign committee assumed that they were capable of producing 40% of the Wayne County vote. The fact that they produced only 32% of the votes, caused us to lose all major state elective offices. You might be interested in knowing that during the campaign I visited all 83 counties in Michigan and travelled over 20,000 miles by automobile, truck, and plane."

Sounds as though he had a wonderful time.

ANCIENT AND HONORABLE. The Speech Association of the Eastern States, which, its secretary, Paul D. Holtzman of Queens College, proclaims as the "oldest speech association in the United States," is planning the Fiftieth Anniversary Convention for 1959. Marvin G. Bauer of Brook-

lyn College is Chairman of the Golden Jubilee Committee.

---

RETURN TO FUNDAMENTALS. Lawrence Gridley Derthick of Chattanooga, Tennessee, the new United States Commissioner of Education, is described by the *New York Times* as being sympathetic to technological advance in personal affairs. He travels by plane "tens of thousands of miles annually to address education groups. At his side on the plane and in hotel rooms is a dictating machine used to prepare correspondence that goes almost daily to school personnel and related groups in all parts of the country." However, on educational policy the new Commissioner is something of a fundamentalist, announcing on his appointment in November that "there is probably not anything really new in the art of teaching in the last 500 years." This set ST to thinking. Why 500 years? Admittedly 1456 A.D. was a good year in education. That was the year Gutenberg's *Bible of 42 lines,* pp. 1282, was printed, if Gutenberg actually did it, and if that was the year; there is some argument. But why 500? Why not 600, say, or 700? Or why not move it back to 399 B.C., when the board of trustees decided Socrates was too dangerous a man to have on the faculty? *Nothing new in 2355* years would make a more spectacular headline. No doubt the Commissioner will elucidate later, probably leisurely dictating definitive dates—medieval and ancient—into his machine as his jet propelled plane takes him on a mission to the hinterlands.

---

MRS. MALAPROP AND MRS. MURPHY. The Red Bank (N. J.) school board is concerned about misreadings of the Lord's Prayer in school exercises. Such similitudes as "Harold by Thy name," "Give us this day our jelly bread," "Lead us not into Penn Station," have the board worried. This recalls the child taken to see a tableau of the Nativity, who complained that he had not seen Round John Virgin (round yon virgin). A family favorite is the one about the child showing off his Bible lesson on the Twenty-third Psalm: "And surely the Good Mrs. Murphy shall follow me all the days of my life."

---

WITH THE PERIPATETICS

The Alfred State Tech Drama Club (Alfred, N. Y.), directed by Mort Clark, took *Our Town* on tour in November. Working their way from Cobleskill to Delhi, the cast and crew spied a barn on fire, and went to the rescue. The citation of their efforts as made by Chief Byrne of the Middleburgh Fire Department, reads, in part: ". . . assisted us in laying hose, directing traffic and overhauling the hay, and the young ladies comforted the hysterical farm wife and small children, who were alone at the time."

Lester Thonssen of City College gave the luncheon talk at the Ohio Speech Conference, Columbus, in October, and journeyed on to address the Speech Assembly at the University of Michigan.

Robert T. Oliver's sabbatical itinerary included Korea, The Philippines, various ports of call in Asia, with a stop-over in Europe. The second semester should find him back on the job at Penn State.

W. Norwood Brigance of Wabash is well on his way to getting his annual 10,000 miles of lecture travel. In October he journeyed to Nacogdoches to address the Texas Speech Association and to give four talks at Stephen F. Austin State College. In November he gave one of the addresses at the 125th anniversary of the University of Alabama. In March he will journey to Texas again, for the State Teachers Association convention in Laredo.

Kenneth Scott Wood of the Speech and Hearing Clinic, University of Oregon, has returned from a sabbatical year in Norway and Sweden on a Fulbright. He lectured at the Children's Clinic in the State Hospital in Oslo, and at the Universities of Bergen, Uppsala, and Stockholm.

Lee Norvelle of the University of Indiana is back from a sojourn in Rome, Athens, and Tokyo, and Thailand. In Bangkok he lectured to the Cultural Society. A colleague, Gary W. Gaiser, will be on leave the second semester to study at Bristol University in England.

Lawrence H. Mouat of San Jose State College, is on leave this semester and summer to study parliamentary procedures in England.

William H. Zucchero of Kent State University Theatre is serving in the Army in Germany and teaching in the Maryland overseas program. He will return in the fall.

Jacob Foster of Brooklyn College is studying the theatre in Europe.

Harry Stiver of the University of Nebraska theatre has returned from a Fulbright in Greece.

Louis Lerea of Northern Illinois State is on leave for a research project at the University of Michigan.

Jonathan Curvin of Wisconsin will be on leave the second term to work on theatre materials in New York and other eastern states.

Daniel Vandraegen of UCLA is spending the year in Europe.

TELEVISION

At least sixty colleges are experimenting with educational TV, reports Cynthia Lowry by AP, December 10. Results "may take the keen edge off the excitement generated at the prospect of electronic education, but it may prove to be a valuable, sensible aid in a fast-expanding area." Pennsylvania State has been conducting experiments to evaluate the success of TV teaching, but the results are not yet available. Meanwhile, many schools report progress.

At Ohio State, Richard Mall has been appointed to plan a clinic designed to bring faculty and students of Ohio colleges together with commercial broadcasters to discuss mutual problems in radio and television. Schools are expanding their programs of TV courses and forums. At Iowa State, W. R. Underhill teaches a TV course in public speaking. At Oregon State, H. M. Livingston conducted a County Extension Agent Television Workshop for the Department of Visual Aids and the School of Agriculture. In the spring term, Oregon State plans to teach a three-section science course by closed-circuit. At Missouri's University-owned commercial station, KOMU-TV, Neal Balanoff directs two weekly productions, "Showcase," featuring various departments of the University, and "Missouri Forum," a panel-discussion program. Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College has a TV series entitled "Beyond the Textbook." Texas Christian students present a thirty-minute production each Friday on KFJY-TV, called "Telerama," with T. C. U. students manning all facilities of the commercial station.

The University of Maine presents a ninety-minute program each Sunday over WABI-TV, and a Telecourse in Maine history over WTWO-TV in Bangor. Gerald Beckwith is in charge of both programs. The University of Oklahoma has completed installation of TV equipment to be used for instructional purposes. They offer a curricular program combining Radio-TV Speech with Journalism and Drama. Southwestern Louisiana Institute has bought a Dage dual camera chain and kinescope and is planning to do programs by remote control through the local commercial station. Wisconsin Players of Madison produced an hour adaptation of *The Shoemaker's House*, written by Ronald Mitchell of the speech department, over WHA-TV in December.

Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, holder of the first educational television low-power channel, plans to convert from closed-circuit to low-power telecasting. Reception will be extended to the academic buildings and residence halls. Low power, only recently permitted by FCC, opens many possibilities for colleges. Notre Dame reports that gross income from carrier-current, student-operated WSND was over $11,000 last year. Commercial stations WNDU (ABC) and WNDU-TV (NBC), also owned by Notre Dame, gave experience to many undergraduates, and some salary.

The University of Maryland announces its annual Victor Frenkil TV Script Award of $500. The script must be for a one-hour production. Entries will be judged on universality of theme and originality of content. Aspirants should get in touch with George F. Batka, Department of Speech, College Park.

---

APPOINTMENTS

Albion College: Helen Horton, director of theatre; Charles Hampton, general speech.

Brooklyn College: Robert West has been appointed clinical professor in the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation in the New York Medical College. He will continue as professor and director of Clinic at Brooklyn College; Eldon Elder, assistant professor of speech and theatre.

Drury College: Warren Wheeler Picket, instructor in theatre.

Eastern Illinois State College: Dan Scully, assistant professor and director of radio; Jon Jopkins, assistant professor and director of forensics; Mrs. Mildred Hofacker, instructor in speech.

Eastern Michigan College: William Bos, assistant professor; August Staub, instructor and associate director of theatre.

Illinois College: Roy Baker, instructor in speech and director of forensics.

Indiana University: Robert W. Wendahl, instructor; Paul I. McClendon, instructor at Indianapolis extension center; Wilbur Lee Martin, James A. Purkhiser, William C. Teufel, Marvin E. DeBoer, teaching associates at University of Indiana's extension centers; George T. Bedard, Irving Cohen, James Elrod, Earle R. Gister, Joseph G. Green, Alex Kemeny, John A. Mills, teaching associates; Henrietta Lenore DuPree, Sandy N. Havens, Robert M. Lewis, Ann E. Menne, Allen Williams, Robert B. Wilson, Jack Ruff, and Betty Shuford, graduate assistants; Mrs. Margaret Hakes, Mrs. Louise Kent, Mrs. Sarah C. MacClain, Shirley McKay, Sharon Williams, and Nancy Kay Williams, graduates assistants in the speech and hearing clinic.

Iowa State University: Charlene Owen, Carolyn Warren, Glenn Rogers, Harry Ausprich, instructors in speech.

Miami University: Charles Baber, instructor in speech.

Michigan State University: Leo Martin, professor in radio and television; Milton J. Wiksell, associate professor in rhetoric and public address; Orville Larson, assistant professor in theatre; James Stitzel, Donald Ecroyd, assistant professors of rhetoric and public address; Huber Ellingsworth, Emily Farnum, Jarold Goodman, Murray Hewgill, Frank Lewis, Thomas Long, Dorothy Skriletz, Horace Shaw, instructors in rhetoric and public address; John Mader, instructor in speech correction and audiology; Agnes David, instructor in theatrical costume and makeup; Geraldine Bertovick, Allan Maar, Richard Alan Seegar, teaching assistants in rhetoric and public address.

Kent State University: Francis X. Blair, assistant professor of speech pathology and audiology; Edward C. Hutchinson, instructor in speech pathology and audiology; Thomas R. McManus, Donald E. Horace, instructors in speech.

Mount Mercy College: Mario Pellegrini, director of the speech clinic.

Northern Illinois State College: James Curtiss, acting director of the speech clinic; Gabrielle Casebier, Don Burks, speech and hearing; James Powell, speech.

Ohio State University: John T. Rickey, assistant professor; Sheila G. Morrison, Courtney P. Stromato, assistant professors of speech science; Harold Obee, instructor in speech; Harold Niven, Jr., instructor in radio; Elwin C. Reynolds, instructor in dramatics.

Oregon State College: Mary Swarthout, instructor in speech; C. N. Harris, assistant director of the clinic.

Reed College: Gerald Kahan, director of the theatre.

St. Lawrence University: Kenneth R. Venderbush, public speaking and debate.

St. Louis University: James M. Horn, instructor in theatre; Patricia Bradley, assistant in theatre. John P. Owdziej, instructor in public address and radio; Joseph Kessler, lecturer in public address; Barbara Knetle, assistant in speech correction.

St. Olaf College: Fred Phelps, assistant professor.

Southern Illinois University: James V. Fee, Beverley Parsch, Mrs. Alberta Humble.

Southern Methodist University: A. Ray Johnson, instructor in speech and theatre; Porter Crow and Mrs. Gloria Read, lecturers.

Southwestern Louisiana Institute: Harold W. Poe, assistant professor; Jeannette Stark, instructor.

State College of Washington: E. James Lennon, assistant professor, in charge of speech and hearing clinic; W. Lloyd Turner, instructor.

Texas Christian University: Clayton Fields, assistant professor and director of technical theatre.

University of California, Berkeley: Leo Lowenthal, professor of speech and professor of sociology and social institutions; Henry Anthony, Richard Deering, John H. Green, Jack W. Murphy, Robert G. Neustadt, John M. Steiner, Kenneth H. Sulston, Allan Temko, Manfred Wolfson, lecturers in speech.

University of Connecticut: Robert F. Hejna, director of graduate program in speech pathology and audiology.

University of Denver: Harold Brasell, coördinator of clinical services.

University of Florida: Jeanne Miles and Johnstone Beech, interim instructors in speech.

University of Georgia: John Guy Handley, assistant professor; Arthur J. Fear, debate coach.

University of Hawaii: Norma Schmutz, instructor; Wanda Ellis, Connie Hall, Leila Okino, Kenneth Sereno, Lorinda Watson, graduate assistants.

University of Houston: Mrs. R. Ray Battin.

University of Kansas City: Jack W. Murphy, assistant professor of speech.

University of Maine: Marilyn J. Moog, Donald Barton, James Barushok, instructors.

University of Maryland: Alice Peet, Frank Dolan, Ted Taylor, Jr., Ruth Price, James V. Hilles. Dr. Glen M. Loney, U. of Nevada; Dr. Clair R. Henderlider, Western Reserve University; Dr. Arthur Stockton Hough, Jr., University of Oregon; Dr. Harold Monroe Jordan, U. of South Dakota; Herbert L. Swan, Menlo College; and Donald Hill, have joined the University of Maryland Faculty for the year 1956-1957 and will teach in the Overseas Program.

University of Miami: Edgar Allyn Thompson.

University of Nebraska: Kenneth Lyman, speech education; Margaret Servine and Harry Stiver, theatre.

University of North Dakota: Ned A. Bowman, instructor and technical director of the theatre; Florence Simon Filley, instructor and supervisor of speech clinic; Evonne Seron, assistant in speech and assistant director of KFJM; Douglas E. Williams and Lloyd E. Williams, graduate assistants.

University of Notre Dame: Frank Andersen

and Richard D. Meyer, assistant professors; Gilbert Rathbun, instructor.

University of Oklahoma: Kenneth Shank, associate professor in therapy; Jack Neas, Edith King, Margaret Hoover, instructors in speech.

University of Redlands: Mrs. Al Johnson, drama.

University of South Dakota: Merrill T. Baker, director of forensics; Todd Willy, instructor in speech; Wayne Knutson, assistant professor of dramatic art.

University of West Virginia: Charles M. Watson, instructor in speech and theatre.

University of Wisconsin: Robert H. Hethmon, assistant professor; James Cleary and Jerry McNeely, instructors; Ronald Allen, Lear Ashmore, Carlton Benz, Rosemary Bernard, Don Burdick, Richard Carrington, Joan Copley, Mary-Frances Cutnaw, Allan Frank, Agnes Harcar, Eugene Jaberg, Marilyn Johnsrud, Barbara Maurer, James McGuire, William Robertson, Henry von Moltke, Lois Ann Wallschlaeger, graduate assistants; John C. Morrow, University scholar; Marion L. Davis, Vera Gurk, Bruce Markgraf, Shirley Mezvinsky, Gene Knepprath, fellows.

Queens College: William Duncan, tutor; Jay Melrose, instructor and speech pathologist at the speech and hearing center.

Wake Forest College: James H. Walton, director of theatre.

---

PROMOTIONS

Boston University: E. Winston Jones, associate professor and chairman of the All-University department.

Eastern Michigan College: Grant Wessel, assistant professor; John Sargent, full-time instructor.

Illinois College: Donald E. Polzin, chairman of department and chairman of the Division of Language, Literature, and the Arts.

Indiana University: Richard Moody, professor of speech and theatre; Richard L. Scammon, technical director of the theatre and professor of speech and theatre.

Kent State University: Arthur L. Kaltenborn, associate professor; Howard Becknell, assistant professor.

Knox College: Rowland K. Chase, chairman of the department.

New York University: Raymond Beard, assistant professor.

Ohio State University: Harold Harding, assistant dean and secretary of the College of Arts and Sciences; Wallace C. Fotheringham, associate professor; Keith Brooks, Robert S. Goyer, Raymond S. Ross, assistant professors; John J. O'Neill, associate professor in speech science.

Ohio University: Thomas Ludlum, Cosmo Catalano, assistant professors of dramatic art and speech.

Oregon State College: E. V. Hildebrandt, assistant professor of speech and director of the clinic.

Pennsylvania State University: Iline Fife, James V. Frick, Harold J. O'Brien, associate professors.

Saint Louis University: Rev. R. A. Johnston, S.J., C. B. Gilford, associate professors; William P. Trotter, assistant professor.

Southwestern Louisiana Institute: Lucille Magnon, assistant professor.

University of California, Berkeley: Don Geiger and Richard Hagopian, associate professors of speech.

University of Houston: Robert L. Scott, chairman of the department of speech.

University of Kansas City: Patricia McIlrath, associate professor; Alban Varnado and J. Morton Walker, assistant professors.

University of Maryland: Richard Hendricks, associate professor of speech and director of the speech clinic.

University of North Dakota: Rita Roach, acting director of speech and hearing clinic.

University of Oklahoma: Albert J. Croft, chairman of the department.

Washington University: Ronald F. Reid, assistant professor of speech.

---

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Drury College: *Dial "M" for Murder.*

Eastern Illinois State College: *The Tender Trap, The Cradle Song.*

Georgetown University: *The First Legion,* three student-written, one-act plays, *The Importance of Being Earnest,* an original musical comedy.

Illinois College: *The Caine Mutiny Court-Martial, Ghosts, Thieves Carnival,* a premiere of a new play.

Indiana University: *The Patsy, The Taming of the Shrew, Blood Wedding, Cinderella* (children's theatre), *Hamlet, The Jordan River Revue, Born Yesterday.*

Kansas City University: *The Circle, Hansel and Gretel, Othello, Darkness at Noon, The Prince and the Night, Playboy of the Western World.*

Kent State University: *Ondine, The Doctor in Spite of Himself, Hamlet, Little Red Riding Hood, The Contrast, A Streetcar Named Desire.*

Miami University, Oxford, Ohio: *The Crucible, Tartuffe.*

Mount Mercy College: An original play by Rita Greco, *Benjamin and Miss Henry, Lady Rosa, The Promise of Peace.*

New York University: Excerpts from opera through coöperation of the Departments of Speech and Music.

North Central College, Naperville, Illinois: *Good Housekeeping, Little Red Riding Hood, He Came Seeing, Hedda Gabler, East Lynne,* several original one-act plays, *The Importance of Being Earnest,* an opera in coöperation with the School of Music.

North Texas State College: *The Devil and Daniel Webster, My Three Angels, The Second Shepherd's Play, The Miser, Spreading the News,* the premiere of an original play by a student dramatist, *The Great God Brown, The Property is Condemned,* and *The Lady of Larkspur Lotion* and *The Rainmaker.*

Oberlin College: *Androcles and the Lion, Hedda Gabler, The Mischief-Maker, Antigone.*

Ohio Northern University: *Born Yesterday, The Crucible, Harvey.*

Ohio State University: *Picnic, South Pacific, Hedda Gabler, The Desperate Hours, The Elves and the Shoemaker* (Children's Theatre).

Ohio University: *Macbeth.*

Oklahoma A & M College: *Twelfth Night, Amahl and the Night Visitors.*

Oregon State College: *Present Laughter, Oklahoma.*

Reed College: *The Rivals, Everyman.*

Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College: *A Woman Wrapped in Silence,* for speaking choir, singing choir, and moving tableaux.

San Jose State College, Children's Theatre: *The Crying Princess, The Golden Goose.*

Saint Louis University: *The Biggest Thief in Town, The Inspector Calls, You Can't Take it With You, Much Ado About Nothing.*

Southern Illinois University: *Night Must Fall, Arms and the Man, Romeo and Juliet, A Streetcar Named Desire, Our American Cousin.*

Texas Christian University: *Born Yesterday, The Judge* (American premiere of a Danish drama), *Imaginary Invalid, Summer and Smoke.* Theatre majors will help produce a children's play, two ballet productions, and *Pdomeneo* (an opera).

Union Theological Seminary: A new program of religious drama, made possible by a foundation grant for an initial period 1956-1959, has begun. Productions scheduled for the first semester: *Christ in the Concrete City, The York Nativity, The Beginning of the Way, The House by the Stable, Grab and Grace.*

State College of Washington: *Of Thee I Sing, Twelve Angry Women, She Stoops to Conquer, Arms and the Man, Plain and Fancy.*

University of Akron: *The Solid Gold Cadillac,* with Frances Starr appearing as guest lead.

University of Arkansas: *A Girl Can Tell, The Heiress, Hamlet, Martha, Tiger at the Gates.*

University of Florida: *Family Portrait, The Play's the Thing.*

University of Georgia: *Picnic, Anastasia, Tiger at the Gates, Don Juan in Hell, Right You Are (If You Think So!).*

University of Hawaii: *Heartbreak House.*

University of Illinois: The Playwrights Workshop presented two original plays, *The Arch* by Kenneth Gaburo, and *Ashlight, Fire New* by Wade Curry. Gaburo also wrote background music for his production.

University of Maryland: *Outward Bound, The Crucible, Twelfth Night.* A musical is also planned.

University of Maine: *Bernardine, Anastasia,* adapted by Guy Bolton.

University of Missouri: Missouri Workshop, *The Rainmaker;* All-student musical, *Wonderful Town.*

University of Nebraska: Two play premieres, *The Garden of Asclepius,* by Oscar Mandel of the University of Nebraska Department of English, and Ernst Barlach's translation of *The Dead Day.*

University of North Dakota: *The Solid Gold Cadillac, You Never Can Tell, Hippolytus, A Streetcar Named Desire.*

University of Oregon: *Country Girl, Man and Superman, A Doctor in Spite of Himself, Desire Under the Elms, Boy Meets Girl,* and a major operatic production.

Wake Forest College: *The Innocents, Antigone.*

College of Wooster: *The Rain Maker, Death of a Salesman.*

---

PHYSICAL PLANT AND CURRICULUM

Wake Forest College, which has moved lock, stock and barrel from Wake Forest, N. C., to Winston-Salem, will have a new Arts Center in which Speech and Drama will be housed. Meanwhile they have a floor in the library.

The main stairway in Aquinas Hall, St. Louis University, is being converted into an experimental theatre to be called the Stairwell Theatre with seating capacity for 30 people.

At the University of Oklahoma the staff in Therapy, Audiology, and School for the Deaf, will move into their new $200,000 building in April.

State College of Washington has enlarged

its speech office space, and is extending the quarters of the Speech and Hearing Clinic.

University of Redlands new Speech Arts Building is now in the planning stage.

Our Pacific reporter is in high mood. He writes: "The Speech Department of the University of Hawaii is celebrating that institution's fiftieth anniversary in handsome new quarters. The old Speech Building, one of those permanently temporary army shacks dating from the Second Sophistic, was allowed to disintegrate at last; and its occupants, insect and human, emerged into the sun. Happy Birthday U.H., say the department members, decorously elated, and bounce a high front vowel against the gleaming walls."

The Hearing Clinic at Texas Christian University is experimenting with dual hearing aids in their preschool for the deaf, ages two to six.

A highly flexible signal recording system is now in use at the Speech Research Laboratory at the University of Michigan. Research is in progress on the electrostatic recording, developed at the U. S. Naval Electronics Laboratory in San Diego, for longer delay time-recording instrumentation.

At Cornell University, the Speech and Drama Department is experimenting with a new all-lecture, nonperformance course entitled "Introduction to Speech and Theatre Art." The object of the course is to present the subject materials of speech and drama as a humanistic study—one of the "common studies" in the liberal arts curriculum. The course is open to freshmen and sophomores. C. K. Thomas delivers the lectures on language, phonetics, and speech production. Carroll C. Arnold lectures on speech composition and forms of public address, and H. Darkes Albright lectures on acting, dramatic production, and the theatre.

A speech therapy program has been started by the Catholic Diocese in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Sister M. Jeanette is clinician at the new Children's Center. Louise Koenig is therapist in the South Hills area project.

---

AMERICAN SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION. The 32nd Annual Convention was held in Chicago, at the Palmer House, November 19-21, the Monday-Wednesday before Thanksgiving. The meetings were notable for the number of students, graduate and undergraduate, who observed the sessions. Elected last year, and inaugurated at the convention, were Raymond Carhart of Northwestern as President, and Virgil A. Anderson as Vice-President. The Exec. V.-P., Stanley Ainsmith, University of Georgia, will carry on until 1958. George A. Kopp, Wayne State University, incumbent Secretary-Treasurer, will serve until 1960. Attendance: 1858.

---

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH. Our parent society doggedly sticks to the Thanksgiving meeting. They met at the Sheraton-Jefferson in St. Louis, November 22-24. One speech section, "Goals in the Teaching of Speaking and Listening," chaired by Donald C. Bryant of Washington University, was included. Convention Theme: "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp. . . ." NCTE carefully noted on the program cover and elsewhere that the quotation is from Andrea del Sarto, Browning.

---

READING HOURS. San Jose State College has a number of oral reading projects this year, under direction of Dorothy Kaucher. Students enrolled in interpretation are giving informal readings, and the advanced interpretation group gave a staged reading from the novel, *The Night of the Hunter*, by Davis Grubb. A prize of fifty dollars, the Dorothy Kaucher Oral Reading Award, is given to the outstanding student in the programs. The University of Pittsburgh is in its second year of the Poetry Reading Group. Once a week about a hundred faculty and students assemble to hear readings in the field of the humanities. Programs are arranged by Jack Kolbert of Modern Languages and Ruth Haun of the Speech Department. In January a member of the French department gave a bilingual reading from Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du mal*. The University of Hawaii's Reading Hour is held every two weeks. Students and faculty participate. The program includes prose, poetry, and group play readings.

---

CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

Among many conferences to be held in the next few months are: Kent State's 12th annual drama clinic for high schools, Feb. 2; the Northwest Drama Conference, University of Oregon, Feb. 7, 8, 9; the 26th Rocky Mountain Speech Conference, University of Denver, in coöperation with the Adult Education Council of Denver, Denver public schools, Colorado Speech and Hearing Association, Feb. 7, 8, 9 (adult and college section), Feb. 15, 16 (high school section); Maine Debate tournament, Feb. 15, 16, and the Maine speech festival, University of Maine, April 20; Northwest Tau Kappa Alpha speech tournament, Montana State University, May 2, 3, 4; Apple Blossom Festival, Michigan State University, May 8, 9, 10, 11. The Festival

is noncompetitive, open to all colleges, and includes readings in drama, poetry, prose, speech and news. For more information, write to Dr. Moiree Compere, department of speech at Michigan State University.

Many schools have been busy during the year sponsoring various conferences and workshops. Among the many coming to Shop Talk's notice are: The first Wisconsin Conference of speech directors, Marquette University, Oct. 9; high school students' debate workshop, University of California, L. A., Oct. 13; ninth annual Ohio Conference for Speech Education, Southern Hotel, Columbus, Ohio, Oct. 13; Mount Mercy novice debate tournament, Mount Mercy College, Oct. 30; Westminster College novice debate tournament, Westminster College, Nov. 3; tenth annual high school debate and drama assembly, University of Michigan, Nov. 3; high school debate tournament, Northern Illinois State College, Dec. 1; Louisiana Speech Association professional conference and speech festival, Lafayette, Dec. 13, 14, 15; oral interpretation clinic for high schools, University of Maine, Jan. 11; eighth annual state speech and drama festival, University of Georgia, Jan. 25, 26; high school forensics tournament, St. Olaf's College, Feb. 1, 2.

At St. Louis University in November, W. P. Sanford directed an intercollegiate "Talkfest," an "informal, subject-centered, and noncompetitive" conference for college students. Actual audiences were supplied, and emphasis was on informal, expository speaking.

---

PERSONALS

T. Earle Johnson of the University of Alabama has been elected Governor of the Alabama District of Kiwanis for 1957.

Harold P. Zelko of Penn State has been appointed advisor and consultant on training to the Departments of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Governor Leader made the appointment.

Glenn Reddick of North Central College, Naperville, Illinois, is lecturing in speech at the Theological Seminary.

Kenneth G. Crider has resigned from Tulane to be consultant on logic and semantics to the IBM electronic brain machines.

Alma Johnson Sarrett (Mrs. Lew Sarrett), has edited a new selection of Lew's poetry, published by the University of Florida Press. Six not previously published poems are included. Yes, "Four Little Foxes" is in the collection which is titled *Covenant with Earth*.

Lester Hale will return to the University of Florida as Dean of Men this fall. This year he is on leave at the Ohio University Center for the Advancement of Learning.

Jack D. Clay is acting director of Oberlin's new Sophronia Brooks Hall Theatre during the sabbatical of J. Stanton McLaughlin.

Edward L. Doyle of Notre Dame has resigned to join WNDU-TV. John D. Tumpane has resigned to devote full time to writing. His play, "The Gift of Tenyin," was premiered at Marquette University last year.

Herschel L. Bricker of the University of Maine is National Chairman of International Theatre Month.

Nancy Thomas of Wooster is continuing graduate study at Stanford. Winford B. Logan is at Ohio State on a Danforth grant.

George P. Rice, Jr. of Butler has received an award from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge for his speeches and articles which have contributed to the advancement of civil and political liberty in the United States.

Victor M. Powell, debate coach at Wabash, is Chairman of the Budget Committee of the Common Council of Crawfordsville. The $600,000 available has to be guarded against raids by W. Norwood Brigance, President of the City Plan Commission.

Jon Eisenson of Queens College has been appointed to a special committee by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to survey needs for federal support in the expansion of speech and hearing programs. The first meeting of the committee was held in Washington, D. C., in December.

University of Illinois. The Fourth New Play Competition has been decided. The play is *The Tiger Rag*, described by the author as "A chronicle of our times—its rhythm is rag-time, and its spangles are vaudeville." The playwright is Seyril Schochner of Ithaca, N. Y. The play will be produced in March as an event in the 1957 Festival of Contemporary Arts. Barnard Hewitt will direct the play. The award: expenses of travel to Urbana and accommodations through production.

The Old Vic Theatre troupe presented *Romeo and Juliet* and *Richard II* at Indiana University this fall. In May the Metropolitan Opera Company will make its annual visit, to do *La Traviata* and *La Perichole*.

---

CONVENTION NOTES—1956

The Speech and Theatre Conference of 1956 was held on schedule, December 27-30, in Chicago. SAA had a full preconvention day of committee meetings on December 26, and AETA

had a full day of programs on Sunday, the 30th. Attendance was a bit under prediction, with about 1700 registered, but there were many visitors, and all in all, the milling around was sufficient to give the proper convention environment.

Executive Secretary Waldo Braden's report was in high mood. Membership now stands at 6,997, an increase of 700 over last year. Despite rising costs of printing and such, there was a $9,000 surplus for the year, with $66,000 collected and $57,000 spent. The reserve is $17,000. The *QJS* has a circulation of 5,082, and cost $11,849.27 to produce and distribute. Full details of SAA finances will be printed in the April issue. ST was pleased to see the forward look in the plan to buy a carload of paper for $4,000. And he was pleased, too, to see that telephone and telegraph had been held to $333.08. Without prejudice to the oral word, it might be noted for those who grab the telephone too often and too late, that a tuppenny postal on time is worth a half dozen belated toll calls.

The Executive Secretary had details at the finger tip. His office handled 100,000 pieces of mail last year, exclusive of journals. 775 members of the profession belong to the Placement Bureau, and last year 450 vacancies were reported. 11,000 copies of the convention program were distributed, at a cost of $2,200.

---

FAMOUS FIRSTS, I. This was the first SAA convention to operate under the new constitution, which became effective January 1, 1956. The sectional programs were planned mainly by the new Interest Groups. Twenty-seven groups and committees sponsored sectional programs.

---

FAMOUS FIRSTS, II. The Administrative Council, counterpart of the old Executive Council, had a busy time of it, despite duties delegated to the Legislative Assembly. The AC considered: raising dues; taking permanent headquarters; a system of emeritus memberships. The AC approved: a mail ballot on time of convention, to be taken after the Boston meeting; an awards program for the 1958 Chicago meeting—a committee on nature and criteria to report plans at Boston; microfilming all numbers of the *QJS* prior to 1939 and volumes I-V of *Monographs*.

---

FAMOUS FIRSTS, III. The first Legislative Assembly met with 125 present of the 200 elected members. Elise Hahn, as 2nd VP, was in the chair. Joseph O'Brien, as Parliamentarian, sat close by to advise on fine points, and Wayne Thompson took items down as Clerk. Attendance dropped off to a steady sixty in the later meetings, five in all. The first meeting opened on a properly serious tone with the reading of memorials to A. M. Drummond, Edward Mabie, Richard Reager, J. A. Winans, and Valentine Windt.

Much of the time went to organizational matters. When did the Assembly members take office? It was voted, with Administrative Council approval, to start as of January 1, 1957, and to regard the present sessions as organizational. What happens when a member of an assembly serving for one year term is elected to a committee for three years? Answer: continue the member ex officio for the entire committee term. There were many elections: an executive committee for geographical areas; an executive committee for the interest groups; a committee on committees. And reports! About fifty were "received." The Legislators wore special badges and that worried, busy look that comes from dealing with world problems in a serious way.

---

FAMOUS FIRSTS, IV. Program arranger Loren Reid's diabolic scheme to get the slugabeds up and around for the first morning programs was regarded with some suspicion before the convention. Who would turn out for an eight o'clock Shop Talk breakfast, and with speeches! But at a quarter to eight there was a crowd milling outside the Hilton Coffee House, and when things got organized it appeared that the 175 places were oversubscribed. About fifty of the most doughty of the overflow got a bite in a drug-store, and came in to line the walls for the speeches. Standing at the chef's table, with a stack of plates for a lectern, surrounded by pans of rolls, glasses of orange juice, and pots of coffee, the seven speakers moralized and amused. The Toastmaster, President Thonssen, was so enthralled that he forgot to keep time, but no one seemed to mind. Although the event was non-competitive, and no plaques or cups were awarded, ST would suggest that the palm was most accorded to the sole feminine entry, Magdalene Kramer, who answered succinctly the query before the house, "What lies ahead and what lies behind what lies ahead?" "The women," she declared. All joined in her after-breakfast toast.

---

THE GAVEL PASSES. The last business session has developed into an exclusive but heartwarming occasion. Twenty-three of the faithful assembled to see retiring president Thonssen pass